

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

AN earthquake is one of the most profoundly disquieting things in human experience. The reason is that it reveals the instability of what was counted most stable. We live in the calm assurance that, whatever changes come, the earth remains steadfast. But if the earth be removed and the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea it shakes the stoutest heart, for it breaks up the solid ground of man's confidence and brings the fearful suggestion that the end of all things is at hand. The psalmist could conceive of no higher expression of faith than to say that in such dire straits 'we will not fear,' for God is our refuge and strength.

The Great War brought an experience of this sort in the world of human affairs. It has overturned so many institutions which were counted most stable and unassailable, it has so completely changed life for multitudes, it has removed so many ancient landmarks that it has spread through the world a sense of bewilderment and alarm, and has suggested to men's minds possibilities of fresh disasters which before would never have been dreamed of.

In these circumstances it is but natural that the foundations of human life in every department should seem to be giving way. Everything is in doubt, nothing can be received for sure. Many find themselves without an inch of solid ground to stand on, cast into a bottomless abyss of doubt. Euclid's axioms have been called in question and shown to be not necessary truths of reason as for ages had been

supposed. Similarly, the root principles of morality, the foundation truths of religion, the settled maxims in politics are all in the melting-pot, and many to-day are asking Pilate's question, 'What is truth?'

Most prominent among the things which are called in question is the Christian faith itself. Its doctrines, its claims, its prestige, the whole manner of life which it sustains, the whole type of civilization built upon it, have been made the object of the most formidable attack. In the current number of the *Hibbert Journal*, Professor MOWAT of Bristol University deals with this subject in an illuminating article on 'The Revival of Heathenism.'

Among the things most surely believed among us nothing was counted more certain than the bankruptcy of the old paganism. Great Pan was dead, without the slightest hope of a resurrection. 'Every civilised person grew up in the belief that paganism was just the primitive religious belief of barbarous tribes, which vanished before the development of knowledge exactly as darkness gives way before beams of the sun.' Missionary effort was supposed to be slowly but surely penetrating the last fastnesses of paganism in the remoter regions of the globe, and its final extinction was only a matter of time.

No doubt in the last two centuries forces of infidelity were at work. Gibbon, for instance, criticised Christianity as an unmanly creed which

aided the downfall of the Roman Empire by softening its martial spirit, and weakened Europe in its conflicts with the Turks. Such attacks, however, caused no serious or widespread alarm. 'Periods or waves of indifference, scepticism, infidelity and anti-clericalism are to be expected, with the balance redressed from time to time by religious revivals. It is all part of the perennial curve or oscillation of religious life.'

The present assault is a far different thing, which calls for the most serious consideration on the part of the Christian Church. It is no mere skirmish, no sectional operation; it is a fierce and determined battle along the whole front, in short a religious world war. It is an endeavour to overturn our Christian faith from its foundations, to uproot it and cast it out of the earth.

What is the nature of the new paganism? For one thing it involves a complete repudiation of the Christian spirit of love and gentleness, peace and goodwill. The Christian Church has never been pacifist. It has always recognized the use of force as legitimate in the support of justice and right. But it has set before the world the ideal of human brotherhood, and the Kingdom of the Prince of Peace. That ideal the new heathenism spurns with contempt. Away with the pierced hand of the Crucified, it cries; we put our trust in the mailed fist of the man of war. 'War alone,' says the official exponent of Italian Fascism, 'brings up to its highest tension all human energy and puts the stamp of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to face it.' In Germany, as is well known, the same warlike spirit is glorified in flagrant contradiction to the teaching and the spirit of Christ.

All this is closely connected with the revival of an overweening and ferocious nationalism. 'The prevailing view of the State in Italy and Germany appears to be anti-Christian and, indeed, pagan. The State is regarded as something different and higher than the totality of individuals who compose it; as something which has a supreme claim upon them; as an end in itself for which the individuals and the whole people are only means. The State is

supreme - omnipotent, omniscient and eternal: that is, it is God.' Such a State will brook no rival, it will tolerate no divided allegiance. The Church must submit or be crushed. And so the age-long conflict between Church and State has broken out afresh, and persecution has become the order of the day. 'I little thought,' said Mr. Baldwin recently, 'as you can have little thought in those days before the War, that we should live to see ministers of the Gospel—and I use the word in its widest sense—suffering for their belief in countries that we had believed to be civilised.' In Russia rampant atheism has for years been in the ascendant and Christian blood has been freely poured out. In Germany there has been no official proscription of religion, but Christian ministers have suffered persecution for simple loyalty to fundamental Christian truth.

It is a testimony to the ineradicable religious instincts of the human heart that this new heathenism takes on in various ways the form of a positive religion. In Russia there is worship of the memory of Lenin together with an elaborate deification of 'communal man.' In Germany and Italy there is a glorification of living leaders amounting to idolatry. As a substitute for the Christian faith a 'German Faith' is offered, according to which Germany is the Holy Land, her people the Holy People, and her *Reich* the Kingdom of God. This religion is being expressed in a Neo-pagan ritual. *The Times* reported last Easter services in North Germany where 'the pastor spoke not at all of Christ but only of Germany,' and where in the evening a heathenish ceremony was performed around a bonfire at which men and women chanted a sort of Hitler litany, followed by the 'litany of eternal Germany.'

These strange aberrations are the result of the upheavals and sufferings which have followed the World War, and it may help us in reviewing them to maintain our mental balance by recollecting that there have been similar chaotic periods in past ages, notably at the beginning of the sixteenth century when the collapse of the Mediæval World was accompanied by 'a flood of pagan ideas and practices.' The crisis of to-day seems to be largely due to

the fact that 'nations have become self-conscious, and egotism, vanity and acquisitiveness have become national passions.' When these passions break out in the individual they can be held in check by social and legal control. But the world has not yet been able to forge an efficient instrument, either in the shape of international public opinion or sanctions, to hold in check the passions of nations. And unless this can be done there is a real danger that these national passions may prevail and wreck the social life of mankind.

For Christians the vital question is, can our faith and moral standards survive in a world of force? To this question Professor MOWAT offers no answer. He is content with the objective rôle of the pure historian, describing certain tendencies of the world of to-day in so far as these can be discerned and judged by a contemporary. At the same time the mere survey of the facts, brief as it is, is fitted to occasion grave concern. If the present resurgence of paganism were successful there would be nothing left between nations but naked force. 'The issue between Christianity and Neo-Paganism is, of course, far from being yet decided, but the comfortable nineteenth-century belief in the inevitability of the progress of Western civilisation can no longer be held. The Christian religion has been one of the greatest civilising forces in the world, and no generation before the present has shown any tendency to assert that Western civilisation can go on without it.'

While, therefore, the Christian Church is fully entitled to the assurance that in any event there are 'things which cannot be shaken' and will remain, yet the present crisis is one the gravity of which cannot be exaggerated. A world may emerge which has renounced the worship of the true God. What did our Lord Himself say? 'When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?' On the other hand, out of the melting-pot the social life of the nations may be poured into a Christian mould. And the responsibility rests on the Christian Church and upon every member of it to labour unceasingly for that great end.

*Jesus Manifest* (Cape; 15s. net), by Mr. Dmitri MEREZHKOVSKY, is a continuation of the same author's 'Jesus the Unknown,' a book which aroused much interest on its appearance in translation form a couple of years ago. This volume carries forward the life of Jesus to its culmination in the passion, death, and resurrection, and is characterized by the same combination of scholarship and conservatism, of historical outlook and mystical 'inlook,' of religious philosophy and Christian piety, as was conspicuous in the former volume. The translator, Edward Gellibrand, has obviously done his work well; and Dean Inge continues his sponsorship of the author, while noting that there is something strange and unfamiliar about the Russian mentality, and many things calculated to surprise and perplex in Mr. MEREZHKOVSKY's presentation of his theme.

An account of the chapter entitled 'The Scourge of the Lord' will serve to illustrate this author's line of treatment and habit of mind. It is, of course, an exposition of the incident of Christ's entry into the Temple.

He begins by laying the blame of the betrayal and the Crucifixion upon the high priest Annas (Hanan in Hebrew). The great market-place of the Temple was the chief source of wealth and power of all the race of Hanan; and suddenly, in one hour, this same market-place was utterly destroyed by 'the Clown-King' on an ass. No wonder that Jesus was thought worth arresting after all.

'Magnificent portals with colossal, twenty ell high, entrance columns of white marble, ceilings of carved cedar wood, and floors of many-coloured slabs of stone surrounded the exterior yard. Here Jesus saw the great bazaar of Hanan, the cattle sheds and the aviary, the many shops and booths where sacrificial salt, oil, wine and incense were sold, and the many exchange tables and counters where pilgrims from all corners of the world exchanged the Roman "unclean" coins stamped with the head of Caesar for "holy silver," the ancient Tyrian "zechel," the only money in which the Temple tribute could be paid. The tinkle of silver on the

exchange tables, the flapping of the wings of the doves in the numerous cages, the abuse, the oaths, the shouts and shrill chatter of the bargainers—bargaining as only the sons of Israel can—the melancholy bleating of sheep and the gloomy bellow of oxen sensing the blood of the approaching sacrificial slaughter—all this blended into one deafening chorus. Heinous profiteering, deception and robbery reigned here in the very heart of the Temple, by the holy of holies.'

Then our author describes in graphic language how at the Lord's entry there was suddenly a great silence, and how Jesus stooped low and picked up two strong 'hempen ropes' and made a 'scourge' of them, and, aided as He must have been by the people, destroyed the crowded shops and booths, overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and cleared the whole of the immense exterior courtyard.

Was there not a secret meaning, our author goes on to ask, in what happened? There are many hints in the Gospels of such a meaning. Probably, when clearing the Temple Jesus said something, something too soon forgotten by friend and foe alike because too incomprehensible, about the destruction of it. In any case is there not an inner connexion between the clearing of the Temple and its destruction—the old polluted Temple to be purified by fire, and a new one built in its place? And does not the Lord prophesy the destruction of all the temples on earth made by hands, and the building of the one and only Temple not made by hands—the Universal Church?

Thus Christ is represented by our author as revolutionary indeed. It is not only Herod's Temple He would destroy, but all temples. 'Christians are greatly mistaken if they think that the purifying by fire—the destruction of the Temple—refers only to the Temple of Jerusalem. No, it refers to all temples made by hands, and to the Christian temples among them—to the churches.' And by saying (in what was formerly the house of God, but was now the house of Hanan), 'I will destroy the Temple,' Jesus pronounced His own death sentence.

Why are there so many desperate attempts to take from Jesus the rôle of revolutionary, to snatch the scourge from the hands of the Lord? Even to the Synoptists the scourge was already an 'offence,' and they make no mention of it. True, He, who said 'Resist not evil,' could not have raised the scourge; but could not He have done so who said 'The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence'? The contradiction between the two sayings is not to be resolved if we take them as immovable dogma. But if we consider them as two movable spiritual experiences, the contradiction perhaps resolves itself. And however numerous are the people trying to snatch the scourge from the hands of the Lord, the new Buddhists, the followers of Tolstoy, and so on, they will never succeed.

When the disciples saw the scourge in the Lord's hand, they remembered the word, 'The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up.' But the word was best understood by Peter, the only one to raise a sword in defence of the Beloved, and John, the only one to remember the scourge in the hand of the Beloved, and perhaps by Judas, one also eaten up by zeal for the house of God. As soon as he saw the scourge in the hand of the Lord, he understood everything, and was suddenly happy.

'The guard was stationed at the last gate, the fortress had been taken by assault. All waited for Jesus to speak, to act, to lead them, and more anxiously than anybody, waited Judas. But Jesus was silent. Perhaps He remembered these two sayings, the one "the kingdom of God is taken by violence," and the other, "resist not evil," and His soul was torn asunder between the two, as a cloud is torn asunder by lightning. Slowly He lifted His eyes, and the burning glance of Judas hit Him across the face like a whip, and suddenly He saw it all. "Having raised the whip, thou hast raised the sword also." The fingers of Jesus loosed the scourge with as great a disgust and horror as if they were clasping a snake. And on the red porphyry of the porch, coiling like a snake, it lay at His feet, silver-grey in the uncertain flashes of lightning.'

# Some Outstanding Old Testament Problems.

## I. The Date of the Exodus.

BY PROFESSOR THEODORE H. ROBINSON, D.D., UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CARDIFF.

THE escape of Moses and his people from Egypt is one of those events which we may justly call pivotal. While it is true that the faith of those early Hebrews—indeed of Moses himself—was a very different thing from the developed religion of later Israel, the one contained the germ of the other. It was there that the long history of Israel's spiritual life began, and it is impossible to overestimate its importance. It is, nevertheless, a striking fact that we are, even now, far from being certain of the date at which this epoch-making event took place. We have accurate information as to the course of history for centuries before it, and it must have occurred at a time of which many records are available. Yet we cannot say dogmatically that it took place in any particular year, and there are still differences of opinion as to the century, even the Egyptian dynasty, to which we must assign the work of Moses. The progress of archeology does help us gradually to clarify our ideas, and to many it seems that the problem is practically solved, but there are still not a few who would dispute the conclusions which the majority of scholars to-day are prepared to accept.

The evidence available falls roughly into two classes, documentary and archeological; we must further add considerations derived from general historical probability. The first class, again, may be further sub-divided into documents of Israelite origin and those emanating from other peoples. In the circumstances the Hebrew narratives are entitled to claim the highest possible degree of credibility. It is true that the actual literary form in which they now lie before us cannot be traced back to within some centuries of the events which they describe, but they embody ancient traditions which we must hold to have been handed down from generation to generation. They may have been modified in the course of transmission (figures, in general, are particularly unreliable), and we may often feel that details are due to the dramatic sense and literary skill of the narrators—there may even be elements imported from general folklore—but we are bound to trust the main outline. We can certainly accept the facts of the Egyptian oppression, the personality and work of Moses, the escape of the people (they were probably far fewer than the numbers given in the Pentateuch suggest), a great Covenant at a sacred mountain, a period of nomad

life, and an invasion of agricultural Palestine, ending in the settlement of Israel on the land. Unfortunately, however, for the dating of the whole series, there is no reference which we can definitely link with other records. The kings of Egypt are nameless, the wilderness period is, naturally, a matter of concern only to Israel, and, though we have records of nomad attacks on western Palestine, we have not yet succeeded in finding any which give us more than a strong probability in our attempt to identify the Hebrew conquest of the land.

When we turn to external documentary evidence, the first point we notice is the entire absence of any reference to the escape of Israel in Egyptian records as they are yet known to us. This is easy to understand; it was for Egypt a very small matter. We can assert with practical certainty that no Egyptian king was drowned in pursuing the Israelites, but it is clear that this detail (Ps 136<sup>18</sup>) does not belong to an early form of the story, or it would certainly have appeared in the Pentateuch. We may—indeed we must—invoke also the narrative of the Conquest, for it is clear that this will help us to arrive at the latest possible date for the Exodus—not less than a generation before, shall we say, the Fall of Jericho. Here we have documents which may help us in the famous Tell-el-Amarna tablets, which date from the reigns of Amenhotep III. (1411–1375 B.C.), and his son Amenhotep IV. (Ikhnaton) (1375–1358 B.C.). In these we find numerous references to invaders of Palestine coming from the east of the Jordan, who are sometimes called 'Hebrews.' But it is by no means clear either that all Hebrews were Israelites, or that all Israelites were Hebrews, and we cannot be certain that these 'Hebrews' are to be identified with the armies led by Joshua, especially since there is not a single name in the Tell-el-Amarna records which even remotely resembles that of Joshua or of any other Israelite leader. There are one or two other points to which we may allude later in our discussion.

Archæological evidence comes to us from two sides, that of Egypt and that of Palestine. The latter is concerned, obviously, not with the Exodus itself, but with the conquest of Palestine, and the most important point is the Fall of Jericho. Unfortunately our three most distinguished Palestinian archæologists give us different dates—Vincent about

1500 B.C., Garstang about 1400, and Albright between 1360 and 1320. Again, we are constrained to admit that we may reach probability, but hardly certainty.

The general historical background certainly does give us limits, but they are very wide. From about 1800 B.C. onwards, lower Egypt was ruled by a race of Asiatic (to judge from some of their names, Semitic) kings. They, however, were always felt to be foreigners, and about 1580 B.C. they were expelled by the founder of the 18th Egyptian dynasty. Some historians, including Josephus among the ancients and the late H. R. Hall amongst moderns, have been inclined to connect these Asiatics (the so-called 'Hyksos') with the Hebrews, and to see in the narrative of the Exodus the Israelite account of their expulsion. It is unnecessary here to enter into the improbabilities of this theory, which has never found general acceptance. The 18th dynasty remained on the throne till the death of the last king, the much-advertised Tutanhamon, in 1350 B.C. The next dynasty, the 19th, lasted till 1200 B.C., and three of its kings must be mentioned, Seti I. (1314-1292 B.C.), Ramses II. (1292-1225 B.C.), and Merenptah (1225-1215 B.C.). From about 1480 B.C. Palestine was a part of the Egyptian empire, and Egyptian garrisons were placed in all important strategic points. Some parts of the country were governed directly by Egyptian officers, but most of the little city states were ruled by their own kings and princes, who, however, owed allegiance and paid tribute to the Egyptian court. In each case the earlier kings of the Egyptian dynasties were strong and vigorous rulers, who kept good care of their Asiatic dominions, while the later sovereigns were comparatively weak and negligent of their northern possessions. Obviously the strong historical probability is that the conquest of Palestine by Israel took place in a period of weakness, such as that which is reflected in the Tell-el-Amarna tablets. The Egyptians were not driven out till the coming of the Philistines (about 1190 B.C.), and even down to the age of Solomon and Rehoboam a strong Egyptian king could claim sovereignty over the land and make occasional raids into the country on that pretext. But the most probable periods for the conquest are two, (a) 1400-1350 B.C., and (b) 1225-1200 B.C., with a possibility of a third, somewhere in the twelfth century, after the Philistine occupation of the coast-lands had weakened the Egyptian authority in Palestine.

Let us now see how far we can combine the dates supplied by these various types of evidence. In Ex. 1<sup>21</sup> we read that the Israelites in bondage built for Pharaoh the two cities of Pithom and Ramses.

Obviously the latter city was most probably built by a king of the same name, and when Neville, the famous archaeologist, asserted that Pithom was to be identified with a city in the Wadi Tumult (quite a good site for 'Goshen'), built by Asiatic slaves for Ramses II., the matter seemed settled. Ramses II. was the Pharaoh of the oppression, and the Exodus took place under his son Merenptah, the conquest of Palestine itself falling in the dark days of the end of the 19th dynasty and the general confusion produced by the advent of the Philistines.

But difficulties soon presented themselves. Neville's statements were challenged by other Egyptologists, especially by the late Eric Peet. An inscription of Seti I. was discovered, on which Asher was mentioned as living in the district assigned to the tribe historically, in the Phoenician hinterland. An inscription of Merenptah alluded to the destruction of Israel, apparently a people already resident in Palestine. It became clear that the names Pithom and Ramses were not essential to the text of Ex. 1<sup>21</sup>, and might easily have been inserted in the narrative by a later scribe, who knew some history but not enough. In Jg 5<sup>27</sup> the tribes of Dan and Asher are both settled on the coast. Now the Philistines passed along the coast and settled in the south-west about 1192 B.C., and a maritime site after that date is improbable for Asher, impossible for Dan. In other words, the Song of Deborah and the defeat of Sisera must (apparently) be dated before 1192 B.C. Finally, the excavations at Jericho—even accepting the latest date assigned its fall—show that the city was destroyed by an earthquake and then burnt, not later than the beginning of the reign of Ramses II. Even before the results of the post-war excavations at Jericho were made known, there was a strong body of opinion in favour of an 18th dynasty date for the Exodus and conquest (cf. especially Dr. J. W. Jack's book, *The Date of the Exodus*), and it is not surprising to find that, with very few exceptions, serious Old Testament scholars have abandoned the 19th dynasty date. We cannot escape from the fact on which the archaeologists insist, that Jericho remained a ruined site from the beginning of the thirteenth century (at the latest) down to the middle of the ninth.

It is clear that a later date for the Exodus and conquest is even more improbable than is the 19th dynasty, and the only serious alternative is in the 18th dynasty. Strength is added to the reasons in favour of this period by one or two other considerations. The word Moses, universally recognized as an Egyptian name, was an element in the names of several kings of the 18th dynasty—Ahmose, Tut-

more—and was likely to have been bestowed on the founding by a princess of that house. But, above all, we are able to connect the Israelite conquest with the invasions of the Hebrews mentioned in the Tell-el-Amarna tablets. Here, it is true, we lack the really direct evidence which would have been afforded to us by a mention of Joshua or of the loss of any cities taken by him. But the conditions of the period were clearly such as to favour the Israelite invasion; if a number of tribes were pressing into the land at the same time, it is not improbable that Joshua and his people were among them, even though they are not expressly mentioned in that portion of the Tell-el-Amarna correspondence which has survived. Israel, with its strong traditions and its fundamental unity as the people of Yahweh, would almost certainly absorb or survive all other groups, as, later, it absorbed or survived its predecessors in western Palestine. And the time allowed for the period of the Judges would seem to be the minimum for the development and expansion of Israel up to the foundation of the monarchy in the eleventh century. An acceptance of this date for the conquest would place the Exodus somewhere between 1500 and 1400.

Even now, however, we are not free from all difficulties. In the first place, if Albright's date for the destruction of Jericho be correct,<sup>1</sup> it hardly lies in the Tell-el-Amarna period. Since, as we have seen, definite links with Israel are lacking in the tablets, this need not be a fatal objection. More serious, though still not necessarily fatal, is the complete absence of any reference to Egyptian domination and Egyptian operations in the Book of Judges. Sisera may have had links with that country, but there is no evidence for them, and the modern

tendency is to connect him with a Hittite occupation of the country. Now through the whole of the thirteenth century Palestine was the scene of Egyptian activity. The armies of the Pharaohs, especially of Ramses II., were constantly passing to and fro. Both Seti I. and Merenptah carried out military expeditions in Palestine itself, and yet none of these has left any trace on the Hebrew record. We might well have expected, indeed, that the devastation wrought in Israel by the latter would have given him a place among the oppressors of the land. The difficulty can, no doubt, be partly met by an appeal to the scantiness of the tradition as it has come down to us. The focus of Israelite life in western Palestine was in the central range, from near Jerusalem to the hills that look out over the plain of Esdraelon. Till late in the period Shiloh was the centre of the national life; the armies of Ramses, who fought no great battle actually on Palestinian soil, would naturally follow the coast road, and Merenptah may well have put the part (and a small part) for the whole when he claimed to have destroyed Israel. But, however we seek to explain the matter, the doubt must remain, and must be strong enough to prevent us from stating dogmatically that the conquest took place as early as the eighteenth dynasty. This age has much the greater probability, but that is as far as we dare go. Even so, we are still left with very wide limits for the date of the Exodus. A date in the middle of the fifteenth century is the most probable, if only because it stands midway between the extreme limits. But, unless fresh excavations or new documents give us further direct light, we shall have to be content with an uncertainty within the defined limits. More important for us is the certainty that the Exodus happened, and that in it the national and religious life had its foundation well and truly laid. As compared with that supreme fact, the date matters comparatively little, and we may rest satisfied with the limited knowledge that we actually possess.

## The Unity of 2 Corinthians.

By the REV. S. R. V. G. DASKE, M.A., HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF  
NEW TESTAMENT STUDY, KING'S COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

<sup>2</sup> *Corinthians* has come down to us as a single Epistle. In no MSS. is there any trace of a division at any point of the text, and in no early Christian writer is there any suggestion that the document

is composed of parts of different letters, or that it was not written at one time to meet one particular situation. And yet, in spite of the complete absence of any external evidence in support of their view,

some modern scholars have felt justified from internal evidence in concluding that there is at least one section of the letter which in reality belonged to a previous letter written by the Apostle to the Corinthians. The last four chapters of 2 Corinthians, it is held by not a few scholars, are not part of the letter which St. Paul wrote from Macedonia when he received the good news which Titus brought back from that city, but formed the closing portion of 'the painful letter,' to which he refers in 2 Co 7<sup>8</sup> —a letter which was written from Ephesus after St. Paul had paid a hurried visit to Corinth, during which he had been personally insulted by one of the Corinthian Christians. It is also suggested by some that the trenchant verses 6<sup>14</sup>–7<sup>1</sup>, which read more like part of a mission address to unconverted people, are also out of place in their present context, but belonged originally to what is usually called 'the previous letter,' which St. Paul wrote before the letter which we call 1 Corinthians, when he heard of the case of incest which had been committed at Corinth, a letter to which he refers in 1 Co 5<sup>9</sup>.

Many critics feel that 2 Corinthians can only be explained on the supposition that it is made up of fragments of at least two, and possibly three, of St. Paul's letters to the Corinthians. 'Tradition,' writes Dr. Rendall, 'has handed down 2 Cor. as a complete and entire whole. In so doing it has robbed it of much of its interpretative value.' It is necessary, therefore, to study carefully the grounds on which the theories for dividing the Epistle are based, and to consider whether or not it is possible to explain the letter as a unity. It will be easiest to consider each of the above mentioned supposed interpolations in turn.

The theory that the passage 6<sup>14</sup>–7<sup>1</sup> belongs to 'the previous letter' is based on the consideration that in its present position it not only interrupts the context, but brings in a set of ideas which are said to be essentially alien to it. St. Paul at this point of the letter is 'opening his heart' in a very intimate manner to the Corinthians, appealing to them with no little tenderness to make a real and genuine response to him—and then in 6<sup>14</sup> he suddenly seems to speak to them in a very trenchant manner, as though they were unconverted and in grave danger of compromising with the forces of heathenism. What a tactless way, it is said, to go to work! How out of keeping with the playful touch of 6<sup>13</sup>, 'let us have a fair exchange. I speak as one would speak to children,' and with the general manner, of St. Paul! How much more explicable is the nature of the language used in this passage

if it formed part of a letter written at white heat, dealing with a grievous sin, which the Corinthians must recognize at once as a grievous sin, if they were not to be entirely untrue to their new profession. In a word, how admirably this passage would have suited 'the previous letter,' which St. Paul says that he wrote to the Corinthians warning them to have nothing to do with fornicators (1 Co 5<sup>9</sup>). Does not this reference throw a flood of light on the kind of language used in 2 Co 6<sup>14</sup>–7<sup>1</sup>? 'What agreement has Christ with Belial? . . . or a temple of God with idols? . . . Come out of the midst of them . . . an unclean thing (or person) do not touch. . . . Let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of the flesh.'

If, moreover, it is pointed out, the section 6<sup>14</sup>–7<sup>1</sup> is omitted from its present context, no ugly hiatus is caused, for St. Paul continues in 7<sup>2</sup> with the same subject as that with which he was dealing in 6<sup>13</sup>, and indeed actually repeats the same words, 'Make room for us.'

The argument does seem attractive, but the fundamental objection to it, which has never yet been answered, is, 'Why should this particular portion of "the previous letter" have been cut out of its original position and inserted at this particular point in our 2 Co.?' No accident can possibly account for such a transference, and no motive can be found sufficiently strong to make its deliberate removal desirable. Does not, moreover, the fact that the writer repeats the words, 'Make room for us,' at 7<sup>2</sup> seem to show that he himself is conscious that he has, for the moment, left his theme, and is now picking it up again? And was it not natural that St. Paul, used as he was to giving mission addresses, should very often use the same type of language even when he was dictating letters to be read by congregations of converted men and women? The Pauline letters, we must never allow ourselves to forget, are not studied literary documents. They are for the most part letters written in the bustle and turmoil of a strenuous missionary career, never meant for wide circulation, or for careful literary analysis, and written by one who could never for a moment forget the reality or the potency of the pagan forces with which the young Christian communities were surrounded. Are any further explanations necessary for the sudden change of tone which the reader notices when he passes from 6<sup>13</sup> to 6<sup>14</sup>?

The theory that the last four chapters of 2 Co. formed the closing section of the 'painful letter' is of a somewhat different character to the supposed interpolation, which we have been considering.

Here we are confronted not merely by a temporary change of tone extending over a few verses, but by one which colours a large and important section of the Epistle. And although, as we have noticed, there is no external evidence in favour of the supposition, it is just conceivable that the Corinthians should have deliberately cut out the original ending of the letter, which St. Paul wrote from Macedonia, which we call 2 Co., and substituted for it the end of the 'painful letter.' The reason usually suggested by those who advocate this theory is that the earlier sections of the 'painful letter' contained personal references to the offender at Corinth, which the Corinthians did not think it was wise to allow to be published for the benefit of the outside world, particularly in the lifetime of the offender. But why, we may ask, should the closing portion of the 'painful letter,' if it was found necessary to destroy its earlier sections, not have been attached to the *end* of the letter of which 2 Co 1-9 is the beginning, instead of being added after ch. 9, as is the case, assuming that this theory is correct?

Is there, however, any vital reason for supposing that 2 Co. cannot have been written just as it stands? To the advocates of the partition theory it seems psychologically incredible that the same man who wrote the first nine chapters should have followed them in the same letter by chs. 10-13. In the latter chapters it is rightly pointed out St. Paul is writing mainly in self-defence. He is not at all sure whether he has the confidence of his readers or not. He threatens that if he comes to visit them again he will not spare them. He is anxious and nervous, and not quite sure whether his quarrel with the Corinthians is really over. In the earlier chapters, on the other hand, the storm-clouds have clearly lifted. All is easy and happy. The Apostle is full of confidence. The Corinthians have been fully tested and not found wanting. In everything he can wax bold concerning them. Joy, comfort, and relief—these are clearly the marks of the opening chapters, as surely as doubt and hesitation characterize the somewhat vindictive and aggressive closing chapters.

That there is clearly a marked change of tone at the beginning of ch. 10 is evident to every reader of the letter. It is, however, doubtful whether in itself it is at all sufficient to warrant the theory that the closing chapters belong to another letter. The change is not really greater than the change at the third verse of the third chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians, where St. Paul, after having entered upon what appears to be the closing section

of the letter, suddenly breaks off with the words, 'Beware of the dogs,' and begins a passage containing a powerful invective against his Judaizing opponents, who have evidently reached Philippi, somewhat similar in tone to 2 Co 10-13. St. Paul, we may well believe, was a man of rapidly changing moods, and it is probable that his letters were by no means always dictated at one sitting or all on one day.

The opening words of 2 Co 10, 'Now I Paul myself intreat you by the meekness and the sweet-reasonableness of the Christ,' seem to suggest that the writer is conscious that he is going to write in a somewhat different strain from the earlier chapters. And he has a motive for so doing. He does not want the Corinthians to imagine that now that they have dealt with the offender there is no danger of any further lapses on their part. He has opened his heart to them in gratitude for their loyalty, it is true, but the good Shepherd is ever anxious for his flock. The seeds of disunion may still be slumbering in many hearts ready to break forth again into life at the next onslaught of the 'false apostles' whose efforts are uncompromising and untiring. There must be no living in a fool's paradise, unaware of possible dangers lying ahead. The Corinthians must make up their minds—all of them—whether St. Paul is really their apostle or not. There must, in the future, be no kind of hesitation about this point. It is as their apostle by divine commission that he is going to visit them once again, claiming the allegiance that is his due; and so it is natural that before he closes this letter which is to pave the way for his visit he should vindicate once again his apostolic authority and show his superiority to other false apostles. It meant speaking 'as a fool,' but events at Corinth had forced him to do it.

But there is another question which is worth asking in considering the unity of our Epistle. Do the closing chapters read as though they were part of the 'painful letter,' which the Apostle himself tells us was written with tears, and which at first he regretted having written? Why should he have regretted writing, for example, about his authority as an apostle, or the glory of his sufferings as a minister of Christ? Were not these themes upon which he very often touched and quite unashamedly in writing to his converts? Why, moreover, should it have cost him tears to tell the Corinthians that all things were for their edification (12<sup>9</sup>), or that 'he was ready to spend and be spent out on their behalf' (12<sup>15</sup>)? Is the tone of chs. 10-13 really as severe as at first reading perhaps it appears to be?

The written word cannot fully unfold to us the state of mind of the writer, but it is certainly by no means self-evident that these chapters are written entirely as angry invective. It is, of course, possible to read them as such, but other interpretations are also possible. How different, for instance, does the whole tone of the passage beginning with the question, 'Are they Hebrews? so am I' (11<sup>22</sup>) appear, if we translate the words 'So am I' by the words 'I too.' There is surely a 'playful strain' running through these chapters, which tends to modify not a little the sharpness of the language, and which makes us hesitate before coming to the conclusion that they were part of the 'severe, painful letter' written, we may well believe, in a very different mood. The reference to his 'speaking as a fool'; the whole manner in which the visions are described at the beginning of ch. 10; the very description of the false apostles as 'the superlative apostles' (12<sup>11</sup>); the request 'to be forgiven this wrong,' in reference to the fact that the apostle had not lived at the expense of the Corinthian church (12<sup>18</sup>); and the words 'Being all along a thorough villain I captured you by deceit'—are not all these signs that the writer is not writing at white heat a letter which can be truly described as a 'painful letter,' but is giving a gentle but firm warning to the Corinthians that he will not tolerate any slipping back into disloyalty on their part?

It is urged, however, by those who would cut our Epistle into disconnected fragments, that not merely is the general difference in tone between the early and later chapters great enough to warrant the belief that they do not belong to the same letter, but that there are actually references in the earlier chapters to statements in the later ones, which prove that chs. 1-9 were written subsequently to chs. 10-13. The words in 2<sup>3</sup>, 'I wrote this same thing that when I came I might not have sorrow,' are said to be a reference to 13<sup>10</sup>: 'For this cause I write these things while absent that I may not when present deal sharply'; the words in 10<sup>6</sup>, 'To avenge all disobedience when your obedience shall be fulfilled,' are said to be previous to the words in 2<sup>9</sup>, 'that I might know the proof of you whether you are obedient'; and the statement in 13<sup>2</sup>, 'If I come again I will not spare,' is said to have been written previously to 1<sup>23</sup>, where the Apostle states that to spare the Corinthians he came not to Corinth. Most students of the Epistle will, however, probably feel that while, if once it is granted that the later

chapters are part of an earlier letter, then these verses in the earlier chapters may well be references to remarks which occur in chs. 10-13—yet in themselves they are not sufficient to prove or even suggest the theory of partition.

It seems best, then, on the whole, to accept the unity of our Epistle, even though it is naturally somewhat difficult for us at this distance of time to bring together all the facts necessary fully to understand it. It is bad scholarship to resort to partition theories in the total absence of external evidence, merely because we do not think it is psychologically probable that St. Paul would have written 2 Co. as it has come down to us. Are we, after all, in a position to say what St. Paul could or could not have done? It is true, as Dr. Inge has reminded us, that we know more about St. Paul than we do about any other great man of antiquity, with the possible exception of Cicero; but do we know sufficient about him to answer such questions as these? We can trace sufficient unity of thought in the document as it stands at least to make the letter intelligible. The Epistle, as Dr. Menzies says, 'is all about a proposed visit.' This visit the Apostle wants to be a real success. Everything must go well, then. The Corinthians must have their collection for the poor saints ready, and must be unanimous in their loyalty to St. Paul. There is one thing that the Apostle fears—and his fear reveals itself in the earlier as well as the later chapters—and that is that the false apostles at Corinth, whose jibes about himself he refers to as early in the letter as 1<sup>17</sup> and 4<sup>2</sup>, may make a further attempt before the Apostle arrives to seduce the Corinthians from their loyalty to him. 2 Co. is written in the hope that this possibility will be rendered impossible. The way in which it is written is psychologically sound, and enhances rather than detracts from the admiration which we feel for its author. He begins by winning their confidence as fully as he can by opening his heart to them in gratitude for the loyalty that most of them have shown in dealing with the offender, and by giving them praise wherever praise is due. He then proceeds in no uncertain language to point out the danger of any further disloyalty on the part of any of them, and tries to crush once and for all the claims of the false apostles. He then ends on a note of affection which is manifest in a very conspicuous way in the closing pages, and which culminates in the quiet, calm words of 13<sup>11-13</sup>, 'Finally, brothers, farewell,' etc.

## Literature.

### THE APOCRYPHA.

THE Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., Litt.D., has long been known as our leading British authority on the post-exilic period in Jewish history, and his earlier book on the Apocrypha has been the standard work for twenty years. He has also shown us the quality of his work as a writer of an Introduction, and his new book—*An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha* (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net)—is, therefore, doubly welcome. It is, however, much more than an Introduction in the narrow sense; it falls into two parts, of which the former deals with 'Prolegomena,' and covers such matters as the historical background, the literary quality, and the doctrinal teaching of the Apocrypha. This section illustrates Dr. Oesterley's close familiarity with the subject, and is marked by insight and sympathetic appreciation. It makes us wish that we were better acquainted than we are with the Apocrypha, and will drive not a few readers back to the text of the books themselves. It goes without saying that some will be a little surprised by Dr. Oesterley's judgments, as when, for instance, he seems to rate *Ecclesiasticus* higher than the *Wisdom of Solomon*. But he always has good grounds for his views, and we feel that it is his critics who are more likely to be in the wrong. We may note as especially valuable the fine chapter on the importance of the Apocrypha for New Testament study. Here we have the answer to many puzzling questions, for the Judaism presented in the Gospels is in so many ways an advance on anything we find in the Old Testament.

The second part of the book contains the Introduction in the narrow sense. Here Dr. Oesterley has followed fairly exactly the model of the 'Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament.' This part of the book exhibits that sober independence which we have learnt to ascribe to its author elsewhere. Views which cannot be accepted are fairly stated, and, though limits of space forbid detailed argument, we feel that Dr. Oesterley always has very good reasons for the opinions he adopts. Altogether we may say that we have here one of the most important contributions made to Biblical study in recent years, and it is likely to hold the field for many years as the best work on the subject for the general reader.

### WILLIAM COWPER.

In *William Cowper and the Eighteenth Century* (Nicholson & Watson; 15s. net), Mr. Gilbert Thomas, poet, essayist, and critic, has added another to the numerous commentaries on the poet's life and work. The *raison d'être* of his book is his claim to show Cowper on the background of his time, especially the social and religious background. Indeed, he goes so far as to say, 'without immodesty or exaggeration,' that this is the first attempt to survey in adequate detail this dominating influence in the poet's life. It was certainly a wonderful age. We are accustomed to think of its religious hardness and superficiality, and to forget that it was the age of Pope, Bishop Butler, Berkeley, of Wesley, Samuel Johnson, Chatham, of Handel, Fielding, Reynolds, of David Hume, Burke, and Goldsmith, to mention only a few names.

It can hardly be said that Cowper stands out as a giant in this company. He is a homely figure, though the twin traditions of his 'effeminacy' and his physical infirmity receive their quietus at the hands of Mr. Thomas. Yet, homely or not, Cowper has qualities that place him high in the hierarchy of letters. In that artificial age he brought men back to Nature. Indeed, Mr. Thomas holds that, if he looked at Nature 'over clipped hedges,' he was 'the first eighteenth-century writer, and, if we except Shakespeare and Milton in certain moods, the first in the whole succession of English poets to look at Nature simply and unaffectedly at all.' He was not, it is true, a creative artist. He was not creative at all. He was a commentator, a critic. And probably he will survive, apart from his hymns, more as a letter-writer than a poet. He may be said to be, with the exception of Horace Walpole, the most attractive letter-writer of that writing century.

Perhaps, however, the main interest of Cowper's life is his own personality. He was very fortunate in many ways, in his friendships, his occupation, his fame. And he needed all the good fortune that came to him, because of the shadows that clouded his soul. His intermittent madness receives a large amount of attention in this book, and the various theories that have been advanced as to its nature and origin are carefully examined. The most reasonable explanation seems to be Mr.

Thomas's own, that it was constitutional, but that it was 'fixed' and aggravated by the Calvinistic Evangelicalism under which and to which Cowper was 'converted.' The Evangelical Revival bulks largely in the background sketched by Mr. Thomas, and there can be no doubt that the hyper-Calvinism which dominated Cowper's mind, and prostrated him with the conviction that he was 'lost,' was largely to blame for the dark and miserable moods that afflicted the poet.

It must be remembered, however, that the insanity *was* intermittent. In the intervals he enjoyed much peace, and even the high spirits that produced 'John Gilpin' and that appear in many of his letters. And one reflects sadly that this side of his personality might have overcome the shadows if Cowper had been 'converted' through the Wesleyan and Arminian side of the Evangelical Revival, and not through the Calvinistic. It only remains to be added that this delightful book, which keeps us pleasantly in the company of Cowper and his friends and his age, is handsomely produced.

#### METHODISM IN AMERICA.

Under the not very attractive title *Men of Zeal* (Abingdon Press; \$2.00), Dr. W. W. Sweet has written a book of absorbing interest in which he tells the story of American Methodist Beginnings. Dr. Sweet is Professor of the History of American Christianity in the University of Chicago, and is the writer of several works on Methodist history. The present book is a masterly piece of descriptive writing, well-documented, and marked by ripe powers of selection and of historical insight. First, Dr. Sweet tells the story of the forerunners of the Methodist movement, giving special attention to the devoted labours of Devereux Jarratt. He then describes the Irish local-preacher immigrants, especially Philip Embury and Robert Strawbridge, and Wesley's first missionaries. A discussion of events connected with the American Revolution follows, and an account is given of the work of Francis Asbury and Dr. Coke. It is interesting to a British reader to note the comparatively slight attention given to the problems connected with the ordinations of John Wesley. This, however, is a topic on which much has been written, especially of late, and it is better that Dr. Sweet should devote his space to an account of native-born American preachers, and an important discussion of 'Religion in the New Republic.' This last topic occupies the last chapter, undoubtedly the most interesting,

and in some respects the most important, chapter in the book. Dr. Sweet's volume occupies a place of its own. Most of the books read on this side of the Atlantic on the subject of American Methodism are written by British writers, the most notable being the late Dr. John S. Simon's 'John Wesley: The Last Phase.' Valuable as such works are, there are obviously special advantages in reading the story as it can be told with the knowledge, sympathy, and understanding of an American scholar. Dr. Sweet has given to us just that book, and it can be heartily recommended. The reader whose interests are wider will find the description of the post-war religious situation, after the War of Independence, extremely suggestive, and will be forcibly reminded of some parallels in the European religious circumstances of to-day.

---

Our generation is witnessing a movement which might be described as 'Back to Paul,' comparable to that of a previous generation whose slogan was 'Back to Jesus.' At any rate Paul is beginning to be estimated at something of his true value for the spiritual life. And this process will be materially furthered by a new book on the Apostle—*Paul's Secret of Power*, by Rollin H. Walker, Professor of the English Bible, Ohio (Abingdon Press; \$1.00). The aim of the book is to state in modern terms Paul's technique for vital living. The writer rejoices in the processes and conclusions of the critical movement, but he wisely points out that its danger is to leave no adequate gospel for man's need after it has done its work. He himself seeks to penetrate behind the forms and moulds of Paul's thought to the religious reality they express. And he shows us that, while Paul stated his experience in terms of the ideas of his own day, we have to use our own forms and not slavishly repeat the metaphors he employs. In this broad spirit, and with a thoroughly evangelical loyalty, the writer deals with the main secrets of Paul's own spiritual power.

*Christ for Us and In Us*, by the Rev. Campbell N. Moody, D.D. (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net), is a simple but very thoughtful exposition of the saving work of Christ. Dr. Moody finds that there is apt to be a certain opposition between the work of Christ *for us* and His work *in us*, leading to different types of doctrine. This dualism he seeks to overcome. 'We lose much when we reduce the manifold grace of God to uniformity. One of the

facts that startle us and put us to confusion is that while we love to comprise all truth in one mode of thought, such as Imitation of Christ, Justification by Faith, Fatherhood of God, the New Testament, both in Gospels and Epistles, delights in variety.' Dr. Moody's treatment of the subject is marked by fine sanity, ripe experience, and deep religious feeling. It is a genuine eirenicon and should prove most helpful.

The Rev. Ernest G. Loosley, B.D., has written a little book whose title was suggested by that of one of Mr. A. A. Milne's volumes of nursery rhymes, *When the Church was Very Young* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net). He affirms that in the early days the Church possessed no buildings, no denominations, no fixed organization, no New Testament, no vocabulary of its own, no dogmatic system, and no Sabbath rest (in the Gentile world); but that it did possess an experience, a store of teaching from Christ, and a gospel. These last were essential to the Church's life and witness, and they, and they alone, remain so. Mr. Loosley appears to be indebted in particular to the writings of Dr. Streeter, Dr. Raven, and Dr. T. R. Glover. The volume is clearly arranged and lucidly written.

*The Sermon on the Mount*, by Mr. Emmet Fox (Harper; 5s. net), professes to be 'a general introduction to scientific Christianity in the form of a spiritual key to Matthew v., vi. and vii.' After a promiscuous assault on all the churches, named in alphabetical order, and a fling at the great universities, the writer declares that 'the Spiritual Key to the Bible rescues us from all these difficulties, dilemmas and seeming inconsistencies.' What that key is he does not make quite plain, but it appears to open the door to certain strange ideas and practices. 'Suppose that in a street accident you find that a man has severed an artery, and the blood is spurting out. The normal course of things is that unless this bleeding is stopped the victim will die within a few minutes. Now, what is the spiritual attitude to take in such a case? Well, it is perfectly simple. Immediately you perceive what has happened, you must turn the other cheek by knowing the Truth of the Omnipresence of God. If you get this clear enough, as Jesus would, for instance, the severed artery will immediately be healed, and there will be nothing more to be done.' By the same 'spiritual' means, if your bank fails you can get all your money back, and more, within a week; you can save a drowning child without going into the water; you can even stop a dog fight. A caveat,

however, is entered to the effect that if your spirituality is not in full vigour you had better tackle the situation in the ordinary way.

Much has been written at one time or another about Christmas Evans, the famous Welsh revivalist preacher. But it is not unfitting, as we approach the centenary of his death (he died in 1838), that his memory should be revived for a new generation. *Christmas Evans*, by Mr. E. Ebrard Rees (Kingsgate Press; 3s. 6d. net), is calculated to do this. It paints a vivid picture of the old revivalist days in Wales, when the Principality was roused from its gross and carnal slumber and began to seethe with a turbulent mixture of religious and political ideas and passions. Through that stormy period the great preacher passed, a rugged and solitary figure, irritable and difficult to deal with, manifesting few of the finer graces of the Christian spirit, but a master of fiery and imaginative oratory, a veritable hammer of God to break stony hearts. Some samples of his sermons are given with the frank confession that they would be impossible in our day. The writer sums up, 'Christmas Evans was in the Golden Age of preaching. More than anyone else he was responsible for that age continuing as long as it did. Others helped to put preaching on the map, but he helped to put the sermon into the soul and blood of Welsh Christians, especially Baptists. The service was of little use to him except as a setting in which the sermon was the precious pearl. . . . Evans did not diminish the devotional parts of the service in order to make more room for a sermon. His sermon was devotional. It made people pray; it helped people to worship; it brought people face to face with God; it made the presence of God real to the congregation.'

'Imagine a group of students, at the end of a term, sitting for an examination. One of the subjects set before them is "the great writers of the Elizabethan period." When the papers are read by the examiners it is discovered that in none of them is there any reference to Shakespeare, or his name is mentioned but casually. Such a thing would be impossible. Yet it is possible in our time for educated men to write and speak of God, of human life, of the mystery of the Universe, and of human destiny with scarcely a reference to Jesus Christ. If that happened in India or China or Japan, there would be no mystery about it. But that it happens in a country which bears the Christian name is simply astounding.' These words from the prelude to *The Man who holds the*

*Keys*, by the Rev. Frederic C. Spurr (Lutterworth Press ; 2s. net), indicate the main thesis of the book. Christ is presented as the One who in His gospel offers the key to the solution of the world problems of to-day. The writer, through his studies and personal contacts, is highly competent to treat of this subject. He writes with sympathy and notable breadth of view, but his criticisms are incisive and thought-provoking. At the same time his exposition of Christian doctrine and policy is very sane and heartening.

Dr. Campbell Morgan has published an exposition of *Great Chapters of the Bible* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott ; 1s. 6d. net). Probably no two Bible students would agree as to which are the great chapters. Dr. Campbell Morgan, however, has submitted the matter to the vote. 'The selection was made by lists sent in of Twelve Great Chapters. Hundreds filled in these lists. These were then sorted, and the chapters receiving the highest number of votes were selected.' Forty-nine chapters in all are included, and each is dealt with in a brief running commentary which covers on an average seven pages. Instances occur where more is read into the text than the words seem able legitimately to bear. Precarious deductions are also drawn, as when the first chapter of Genesis is interpreted as giving not simply a record of Creation, but 'of a cataclysm overtaking the earth' subsequent to its creation, 'and of the method by which the earth was restored from the chaos resulting from the cataclysm, into order.' Apart from such points the whole exposition is a field of rich spiritual pasture where many will delight to browse.

Dr. John Watson said that if he had to begin his ministry over again he would preach more comforting sermons. Here is a volume of comforting sermons, *Overcoming Life's Handicaps*, by the Rev. K. M. McRitchie (Marshall, Morgan & Scott ; 3s. 6d. net). They make wholesome and interesting reading, being illustrated by an unusual number of encouraging anecdotes. One notes, however, in certain cases a lack of historical accuracy and an undue love for high colour. John Welch was Knox's son-in-law, not his father-in-law, and the story of three of David Livingstone's children being buried with their mother in Africa is quite without foundation, and it is difficult to imagine from what source it could have been derived. The sermons, however, are in general full of plain, wise, and Christian teaching, such as is well fitted

to bring comfort and good cheer to burdened hearts.

*Standing by the Cross*, by Mr. J. T. Mawson (Marshall, Morgan & Scott ; 2s. 6d. net), contains twelve gospel addresses. 'Christ and Him crucified is not more popular to-day than when Paul preached his gospel in proud and pleasure-seeking Corinth ; but it is just as needful now as it was then if men are to be saved and made to live unto God. Then it was to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness, and to-day it is despised by those who prefer the gospel of evolution and human progress ; but as then, so now, it is the power and the wisdom of God to all them that believe. I am one of them that believe. Christ, once crucified but now risen and glorified, is my Saviour, and to Him I bear witness in these reported addresses.' The writer would doubtless rank himself with the Fundamentalists, and some of his methods of reasoning may appear dubious, but every reader must feel the passion of his convictions and the warmth of his devotion. His is real preaching, simple and scriptural, urgent and home-coming. 'He stands as though he pleaded with men,' and one can well understand that his words have been blessed to many.

*The Promise is to You, 10,000 Miles of Miracle— to Palestine*, by Mr. J. Edwin Orr (Marshall, Morgan & Scott ; 1s. net), is an account of travel all over Europe by a man who 'hadn't a cent,' and always got enough through prayer for the next stage of the journey. Paris, Switzerland, Turkey, Athens, Rome, Palestine, and Spain all saw him in turn, and heard him, for he found like-minded folk wherever he went, and addressed them, generally with conversions. And the money came for expenses, always in answer to prayer.

On the 'jacket' of *The Prophetic Character of the Psalms*, by Mr. E. Béndor Samuel (Pickering & Inglis ; 2s. 6d. net), the publishers remark, 'The sidelights of interpretation, the references to the Hebrew original, the wisely chosen quotations, the illuminating footnotes, and apt references are of very special value to Bible Students.' Their judgment (be it noted that the author himself makes no such claims) is not borne out by the contents of the book. The title is misleading, for less than twenty psalms are discussed, some of them somewhat briefly—a fact for which the author gives his reasons. The Psalms chosen are those which Mr. Samuel can interpret in a Messianic

sense. The references to the Hebrew original involve a confusing phonetic transliteration, and show little sign of the very great advance which has been made in Hebrew philology during the last seventy years. The quotations and references are wise and apt only when seen from a special point of view (Perowne and Hengstenberg, both admirable in their day, are the commentators most often quoted), and the work generally is valueless for Bible students as such.

'Bible students,' however, form only a minor element in the Christian community, and can be trusted to find what they need elsewhere. If we turn from the publishers to the author himself, we shall form a very different opinion of his work from that which is suggested above. Mr. Samuel is a man of high Jewish descent, who can justly claim, like St. Paul, that it is his heart's desire that Israel should be saved. As addressed to Jews, particularly conservative Jews, his appeal and his reasoning should be valuable. He knows their mind, and he has seen the glory of the Crucified and Risen Christ. His aim is to interpret this supreme spiritual experience in terms of the Old Testament, treating the Scriptures along lines with which his particular audience is familiar. Further, though many readers will disagree on a number of points, the whole conception of prophecy among them, they cannot be blind to the deep spirituality and the intense Christian experience often indicated. We may not endorse all that we read in this volume, but not a few of us will lay it down with the feeling that we have been for a time in the company of a man who knows God.

*The Purpose of the Old Testament*, by Mr. W. J. Ferrar, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net), contains 'the substance of lectures delivered to Day-School Teachers in the Diocese of Winchester,' and covers a wide field in a short space. It deals with the general character and place of the Old Testament, and gives in outline some of the more important critical conclusions generally accepted among modern scholars. It gives a fair summary of the prophetic teaching, and concludes with a section on the permanent value of the Old Testament to which the whole of the rest of the book leads. While Mr. Ferrar is not a professional student of the Old Testament, and from time to time introduces details which further knowledge or consideration would lead him to modify (his remarks on the relation of Deuteronomy to the temple at Shiloh are a case in point), he has read widely in the current literature of the subject, and has produced

a useful little sketch which might serve as an introduction for readers who know little or nothing about the scientific study of the Bible. The opening section and the conclusion seem to be especially valuable.

*Advent in India*, by Mr. Maxwell S. Leigh (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net), consists of four lectures originally delivered in Winchester Cathedral under the auspices of the Diocesan Religious Studies Committee. These lectures are most admirably clear and instructive. They deal with the religious history of India, its sacred scriptures, its priesthoods, all with the intention of helping Christian missionaries and Christian people to appreciate and approach with sympathy. It is, in the writer's opinion, 'absurd to maintain that the Indian Empire has, for the past hundred years, been held by the sword. It has been held because the best mind of India has believed that British rule would lead India on to new levels of achievement. It has been held because many of those who bore the sword regarded themselves as ministers and stewards, ever willing to serve those whom they led. . . . It has been held because alongside of those who bore the sword have been the judges and administrators, the teachers and the doctors, the builders of bridges and the designers of canals, and not least, the men who brought a message of love and hope to the out-caste and poor.' 'The youth of both sexes in India are at the present moment full of zeal—they are eager to learn from anybody who will teach them, and they are eager to turn their lessons to practical account, for the good of the country as a whole.' The book though brief is singularly illuminating, and gives evidence of wide knowledge and profound reflection.

The publication of broadcast talks on various subjects is providing us with a number of excellent handbooks which deserve to be popular. *The Way to God* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net) contains a second series of talks on the Christian religion. It follows an earlier volume published last spring under the same title. The present volume contains talks by the Rev. Father C. C. Martindale, Professor C. E. Raven, and the Rev. G. F. Macleod. The first named is a Roman Catholic, the second an Episcopalian, the third a Presbyterian, and the harmony of their presentation of Christian faith and life may be taken as an evidence of the agreement on fundamentals which really exists among Christian people despite their differences. Father Martindale gave three talks on Jesus Christ, Canon Raven gave three on

Christ's power in history, while the Rev. G. F. Macleod dealt in two talks with the Abundant Life. Each speaker in conclusion gave a talk in which questions sent in by listeners were dealt with.

These perhaps form the freshest part of the book, but the whole is admirably done in a clear, straightforward, and persuasive way. They are well fitted to commend the faith.

## An Armistice Sermon: The Church and Peace.

BY THE REVEREND JAMES REID, D.D., EASTBOURNE.

'Look to yourselves, that ye lose not the things which we have wrought, but that ye receive a reward.'—2 Jn 8 (R.V.).

THERE are some things in life we dare not forget, and one of them is the fact that seventeen years ago the nations of the world emerged from the greatest war in history. To-day, in the presence of God, we recall the fact, and listen to what God is saying to us as we look back and forward. November 11th used to be known as Armistice Day. There is a suggestion that it should be known as Remembrance Day. Those of us who had reached manhood and womanhood at that time can never forget the emotions of relief and joy that swept over our souls that day. But there is a generation growing up to which the word Armistice means little or nothing. Yet we must still keep the day, and I hope shall ever keep it, till one day—please God—the nations keeping this day will celebrate it, not as the ending of that War but as the ending of all war—the day on which it was finally banished from the world.

If that hour is to come, it will come as we force ourselves to remember before God that disastrous time, and take to ourselves the message that comes to our souls from God in the hour of solemn recollection.

This text has nothing to do with the subject. John is not thinking of world peace as one of the things which Christ brought. If he had lived to-day he would have thought of it. He was thinking of such things as a clean life and the faith in Christ as Lord, and the hope of immortality. But we can apply it to the lessons of war—the fruits of war. For the War did teach us something—then. Seventeen years ago the message of it shone out crystal clear against the smoke of battle, and as the years went by, it was printed deep on some of our hearts. The danger is that as time passes, for some of us, and perhaps more especially for the younger generation, these lessons tend to be for-

gotten, and because they are forgotten there is peril. We begin to talk about war, to think about war, to plan our national policy in terms of possible war, to doubt the possibility of getting rid of it, and the effectiveness of the League of Nations. And so, bit by bit, the defences of our souls against the catastrophe of war are worn down, and we are once more at the mercy of primitive fears and passions. That is the danger to-day. It is that we forget the past and let its message slip. The man who forgets the past and all we learned in those dark and shuddering days is not fit to meet the future. When one hears some people talk about war, one wonders if God can teach them anything. We are thinking to-day of the men who died. Every name means a grave in some heart or hearts, a scar that will never fade. If we could hear them speak to us this morning, the unanimous voice of millions from the battlefields of Europe and beyond would be this: 'Look to yourselves that ye lose not that which we have wrought, but that ye receive a full reward.'

What is it that to-day should rise into our minds as we think of the lessons of the War?

I. First of all there is the horror of war. We need not dwell on that, for to dwell on the horror of war and the fear of what it means is not the best way to get rid of it. Fear of evil is never the best of motives. There are young people to-day, and all honour to them, to whom danger and adventure and even sacrifice is a positive attraction, especially in a world where millions of able-bodied men are enduring the boredom of unemployment. That is why it is questionable whether war plays, even such plays as *Journey's End*, are useful as peace propaganda. I sat one day in a picture-house and watched a film showing some aspects of fighting in the air. It was a ghastly film in many ways, as one after another went out and came back no more. But after each exploit in which bombs were dropped on the enemy depots, and houses and men went

up in smoke, there arose from the younger members of the audience a volume of applause that was heartrending to any one who cares for peace. Yet when we think of war and modern war, do not let us forget what it means. Don't let us forget that it means millions slain ; millions mangled ; thousands driven mad ; women and children dead of starvation ; thousands choked with poison gas ; men turned into animals with all the passions let loose in raging floods. It means hell let loose. And all the heroism and self-sacrifice which we admire—even that is poured into the channels of destruction ; it is all a gigantic sacrifice of human bodies and souls to the devouring Moloch. Don't let us forget the price of war when we talk of it, and whatever may have been the horrors of past wars, they will be as nothing to the horrors inflicted on millions of innocent people should war again arise in Europe. That horror was one of the lessons of war. Once for all, the romance that has clung around it from the days of old is revealed as an illusion. It is blasted clean out of existence.

But a second thing is the futility of war. Modern war settles nothing and it unsettles everything. How can it settle anything ? How can it do anything except stir up fears and animosities, and provoke in the victors the spirit of domination, and in the vanquished the spirit of revenge ? How can a Treaty conceived in the atmosphere of war be anything except unjust ? Think of the Peace of Versailles. Not long ago an Austrian gentleman said to me that the Peace after 1870 had made one Alsace-Lorraine in Europe ; but the Peace of Versailles had made twenty-eight ! And the poison and bitterness of these so-called settlements is fermenting in Europe to-day, and is the root of a good deal of our trouble. War achieves nothing. The method of force is futile and must be futile. Hate and bitterness can never build any kind of a world except a devil's world. It is a house built on the sand. Christ was perfectly right. They that take the sword shall perish by the sword. The only kind of better world is a world of fellowship, of goodwill, of brotherhood. That is our biggest need. How can bayonets create brotherhood ? How can force achieve fellowship ? How can it make a better world to burn down cities and blight the lives of thousands of innocent people ? Not long ago one of our scientists, applying his knowledge of science to the world of human souls where it cannot obviously give any guidance, said that war was Nature's pruning-hook. It is a familiar idea, and a very shallow one. For when we take a pruning-hook we do not cut down

the best plants in the garden. One could see some sense in it, if, as some one suggested the other day, the statesmen and financiers who made war should be put in the front line !

But, most important of all, do not let us forget that the one good thing which did emerge from the War was the determination to prevent it at all costs, and to find a way of living and working together in peace. That was the best fruit of the War. We can remember in those first days the articles that came out in our newspapers—recruiting stuff most of it, but sincere. This was a war to end war. It was a war that called for sacrifice in order that this thing should never happen again. That dream shone in the souls of the best men who went. Without it, till conscription came, we could never have got an army to fight. The thing would have collapsed. And that dream, that vision, found a body in what we call the League of Nations, now established and working at Geneva. I am not going to defend the League of Nations, or to recount the numberless triumphs which it has to its credit. It stands for the fact that the best way to prevent a war is to stifle a quarrel at the beginning, but that is never so spectacular a thing as to win a victory in battle. The man who keeps the streets clean, so that the air is free from plague, is not so dramatic a figure as the man who fights the plague when it has started. The achievements of the League of Nations can never make such thrilling reading as the exploits of generals or heroes on the battlefield ; but they are just as real and far more effective.

With some people to-day the League of Nations is losing prestige. There are those who pour cold water on the idea, but if that goes, what have we left ? There is no other possible machinery for the spirit of peace among the nations to-day, except that which attempts to bring the cause of wars and the frictions that arise among nations into the light of public opinion, and which is seeking to create the sense of international justice. It is difficult work, no doubt, and we can only take a step at a time. But go back in mind to the days in this country or in America, when communities were switching over from the method of settling individual quarrels by the sword or the revolver to the method of the judge and the court of law. That was difficult enough. It was difficult to get people to trust one another to be fair. But confidence was built up ; and to-day the man who attempted to settle a dispute with his neighbour by force would have the whole community against him. He would be told that, whatever his wrongs, he had no right to take the law into his own hands, and, if he did, he would

be the enemy of the community. It is that spirit which the League of Nations is striving to create; and slowly, but surely, it is doing it. To sow suspicion of the League is as bad as if a man went about in the community telling people that they could not depend on the police or the law court, and that their only plan was to buy a revolver! The League of Nations has only one kind of support, and that is the confidence of the people of the nations. There is only one way to strengthen that confidence, and that is to trust the League, to use it, and to determine never to use any other method, whatever happens. To weaken the prestige of the League of Nations by apathy or mistrust, to do anything or say anything to bring discredit upon it or to suggest that it has no power, is to run the risk of losing what our men fought for, whether they knew it or not. It is to turn our backs on the plain lesson of God in history. It is to forsake the road into which for our very life, as we realized, God turned our bleeding feet seventeen years ago. Look to yourselves, that ye lose not that which ye have wrought, but that ye obtain a full reward.

II. This is a word very specially for the Church. For what is the ideal, the faith behind the League of Nations? It is part of the dream of the Kingdom of God among the nations. It is the dream which Christ opened our eyes to see. It is the dream for which He died. There are depths on depths of meaning behind the death of Christ. For some people that was an act which concerned their own personal salvation. 'He died for me.' That is true. But was it merely to win a few individuals here and there from the grip of some kinds of sin that Jesus died? Would that have satisfied His great heart? He was a patriot. None loved his country more than Christ loved His. All the burning fire of patriotic spirit ran in His veins. 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem,' He cried, as He wept over the city. But He had a larger vision—the vision of a world at peace, of people coming from the east and the west, the north and the south, and sitting down together in the Kingdom of His Father. That was His dream, a world-wide Kingdom of God into which each nation would bring its best. That dream flamed up in the mind of Paul and others. It came to life in a perverted form in what was called the Holy Roman Empire—an empire of the Church, but maintained by force and fear and cunning. Again it died, or rather it slept for centuries, while history swarmed with wars, and Europe ran with blood. But at last it came to life in the Great War and after, forced on men's minds by the desperate need to find some way of

living together in this crowded earth, where nations and races have had their separating walls levelled by science. Here we were in the same house called the earth, meeting each other in the corridors every day, occupying the various rooms, exchanging goods. We had to learn to live together, to find some way. And so the dream of the Kingdom of God, where the nations have found the spirit of brotherhood and understanding, flamed up again. But it was there all the time. It is Christ's dream. The world cannot live without Christ. For the more it tries, the more it goes its own way, the more it comes on some crisis, some trouble, some difficulty, that needs Him and His message and Spirit. This dream of a warless world is not the invention of President Wilson or any other. It is the plan of God. It is the Church's task, therefore, to set it forth and to believe in it, to make it live, to keep it flaming before the eyes of men. Whatever happens, that dream will never die. There may be some frustration, one nation after another may break away. But in some form or another the demand for a common life among the nations will return. That light, once kindled, can never go out.

III. It is only through the sources of Christianity that it can come to pass. For what is it that hinders it? What is it that at this moment is keeping us from realizing the Christian commonwealth, the Christian League? It is things like fear and animosity and race and colour hatred, and old traditions of dislike and suspicion—things in the blood and in the heart. And only the Spirit of Christ can cast these out—nothing less. The world is perfectly right. Human nature in the raw, unchanged, without the transforming power of love, is a dangerous thing. But that does not mean that it cannot be transformed. And Christ saw His vision and held on to it, because He knew that in God there is the power to realize it. The Church which gives way to fear and suspicion is false to her faith. We cannot believe that the same heroism and comradeship and sacrifice which patriotism evoked, cannot be evoked by the call to peace and the vision of a better world, if only we would make that appeal with all our power. For when we make that appeal, that call for service and brotherhood, we are bringing into play the power of God. To refuse to make it and fall back on fear and suspicion is to be false to our gospel. The very first victory the message and spirit of Christ won in the world was the breaking of the barrier between Jew and Gentile. 'He has abolished the enmity that was between us,' wrote Paul, 'nailing it to His Cross. By Him we

have both access by one Spirit unto the Father.' He saw a power at work, through his preaching, which was drawing men together, and which had for its aim the building of people of all sorts and of all nations into a holy temple in the Lord.

To stand for peace at all costs will mean sacrifice. The Church ought to face it. We must not trim our views to the opinions of people, or to the political level of the State. The Church must be willing to take a stand. The Church of every land ought to say to the statesmen of their respective countries that war must be ended; that if it should arise in defiance of solemn oaths and pacts she will urge her people all over to resist and to refuse their support. That may mean sacrifice and unpopularity. It would be the first step to recover for the Church the respect of the world, and it would provoke a response such as we do not dream of. There is no statesman in Europe who would dare take a stand or pursue a policy in defiance of the unanimous opposition of the Christian Church. But even if it did mean the loss of popularity and prestige, have we forgotten the beatitude, 'Blessed are ye when men persecute you'? Christ knew what would come to people who were willing to be all out for His way of life and His purpose. I sometimes wonder if the Church has not got to die in order to live, to die to popularity and the wrong kind of respect and success, and the pomp and power that come from money and learning—to die to all that, in order to live. Shall we ever achieve anything without this willingness to die, to be nothing, to be a spiritual

minority in a pagan world, despised and poor and lonely? It might be the beginning of new life. For any sake let us be done with trimming and compromise, with wondering what people will think or say or do, and face up to the way of Jesus; and the way of Jesus was the way of suffering love. The world of His day crucified Christ, but it was not Christ who finally died. It is through sacrifice we achieve. Let us recall the story of how the gladiatorial shows in Rome were stopped. It was in Christian days, but these things went on. Soldiers fought one another to death for the amusement of people whose consciences were asleep. Then one day an aged monk went down into the arena, flung himself between two fighters, and took their blows in his own body and died. But it killed the fighting for ever. The conscience of the people was awakened. The combats of the arena were finished. It is always the way. It is a fact that what has been won in sacrifice can only be kept in sacrifice. It is to this sacrifice that Christ calls us to-day: this faith, this way of peace. The surest way to want it for the world is to have it for ourselves. The man who has God's peace in his own heart—the peace that knows no antagonism, no fear, no suspicions, no hatreds—will know that he has something which the world needs. He will have lost a taste for war. He will spread peace, think peace, carry peace, live peace. His feet will, wherever he goes, be shod with the gospel of peace. Through him, and others like him, peace will become a living reality.

## Experiments in Christian Service.

### I. St. Francis and To-day.

BY JOHN S. HOYLAND, WOODBROOKE, SELLY OAK, BIRMINGHAM.

THERE is a growing number of people who believe that the great, final, wholly binding sacrament instituted by Jesus Christ is the sacrament of the feet-washing: that our Master meant what He said when He used the decisive words of institution, 'If I then have done this menial service for you, you must do such menial service for each other. . . . If you understand these things, happy are you if you do them.' We perceive around us the rivalries between classes and nations becoming daily more dangerous, and the forces both of

statesmanship and of Christianity totally unable to arrest the drift towards the brink of the precipice. But we dare to believe that the present situation carries within itself the seeds of its own solution, because the more bitter animosities have become, the more opportunity is there for the following of the way of Christ.

We look at His life, and we see a constant manu service rendered to the dispossessed, the social ostracized, the alien. The healing of the sick, the cleansing of the lepers, the feeding of the hungry

are a spiritual service of reconciliation, and of salvation, to those needy crowds, *because* they are a manual and a menial service. When the Church separated the service of the Word from the service of tables, and set the latter below the former, it was departing fundamentally from the spirit and example of its Master. When the Barbarians overran Europe, civilization was conserved, and re-established on a more Christian basis than before, by the little bands of devoted servants of the poor—the primitive monastic communities—which went out defenceless amongst the savages and worked with their hands for them, restoring good agriculture, tending the sick, feeding the hungry.

In the thirteenth century Christianity was saved from a threatened disintegration, and Christian civilization was brought in an amazingly short space of time to its highest culmination in the great age which created the organs of representative democracy, the universities, the great cathedrals, the beginnings of modern art, the scholastic philosophy, European vernacular literatures, the great medieval internationalism. These things happened because one man, Francis of Assisi, took the example of Christ to heart, and obeyed Him. As he washed the lepers' wounds in the lazaretto: and as he sent his brethren out to work with their hands for the poor, without reward, but with much joyful singing, Francis recaptured the essential element in Christianity, the Holy Sacrament of the Feet-washing, and released into effective action in the world an irresistible force both of reconciliation and of creation. He attacked the problems of his time, in the sphere of inter-class and international animosity, by *action*, by getting rich men to wash the sores or dig the fields of poor men, by sending Italians to help the peasants gather the harvests in Germany, or Frenchmen to heal the sick in England, and that not as the missionaries of a superior culture, but as menial servants. The method was folly.<sup>1</sup> How could a handful of these fools in Umbria alter the world, or affect history? But they did, and they continued to do so as long as they stood by their founder's ideals.

If the thing has worked once, it may do so again. It *must* do so again. We need not worry about numbers, about publicity, about influence. The only thing that matters is that we should tread the way of Christ, a little as Francis trod that way: that we should be at work, in the spirit of the feet-

<sup>1</sup> An Austrian leader said to some of us this summer: 'Your method is inspired nonsense—bringing foreign workers to create work amongst workless Austrians; and yet, it succeeds.'

washing: that we should discover spheres in which we may serve *with our hands* the dispossessed, across the bounds of race, nation, and class, and without reward.

The programme which we must follow has been well phrased by an eighteenth-century Franciscan, John Woolman, in connexion with his desperately dangerous missionary journey to the Indian savages, in time of intercine warfare between Whites and Reds: 'Love was the first motion, and thence a concern arose to spend some time with the Indians, that I might feel and understand their life and the spirit they live in, if haply I might receive some instruction from them, or they be in any degree helped forward by my following the leadings of Truth amongst them.' We must go in a spirit of humility, and live amongst the people whom we would serve for reconciliation. We must go not as leaders, propagandists, talkers, but in *genuine* humility, just to work with our hands, menially, for our friends, and to find out, as we can only thus find out, what are the best elements in their psychology and practice. But all that we do must be conceived and carried through in the Spirit of Christ, in the Spirit of Christ as He healed the sick, fed the hungry, instituted the Sacrament of the Feet-washing.

What avenues have opened up before us for such 'Franciscan Service'? At an important meeting held in the University of Cambridge in February 1935, a great modern Franciscan, Charles Andrews, appealed for the sending forth of bodies of young people, to any part of the world, for reconstruction work in connexion with great natural catastrophes, or clamant popular needs, such as unemployment. Such work must be done 'with pick and shovel' in the attempt to follow the Franciscan ideal, and it must be done without the desire for reward. In consequence of this appeal a strong English party, numbering about seventy in all, was organized from Cambridge for Franciscan work in the enemy country of Austria, during the summer of 1935. It was found that allotment-gardening work, of a co-operative character, could be organized for unemployed men at a centre of severe unemployment distress called Mariental, about twelve miles from Vienna, provided that a sufficient number of English volunteer workers could be obtained. Everything depended upon this condition being fulfilled. Without the English it would be impossible even to begin the work: and without enough of them it would be impossible to obtain the temporary unemployment relief for the Austrian unemployed workers, otherwise doleless, who-

would be co-operating with us and running the allotment association after we were gone.

The cheapest travelling and catering rates obtainable made it appear that three weeks spent on this job would cost English students and others about £10 each; for Vienna is a long way away. Altogether, it did not seem at all probable that anything like a sufficient response would be obtained to the appeal. However, meetings were held in Oxford and Cambridge Universities, at certain of the Public Schools, and at other places; and eventually some seventy English volunteers were enrolled, who went out to Vienna in small batches during July, August, and early September 1935. There were red-tape difficulties connected with the beginning of the allotment work; and the first part of the time was spent by the volunteers, together with the Austrian unemployed workers, in the construction of a paddling-pool for children, and a bathing-place for adults. Later, when the allotment work began, rapid progress was made; and a fine spirit of camaraderie developed between the English and the Austrian workers. These latter knew that we were working for them, and paying for the chance of doing so. They knew also that they would be taking on the allotments which we were digging together. They would discuss with us the stuff to plant, and methods of working. The condition of these men is desperately bad. They have no dole under normal conditions, and are thrown back on begging or stealing. The local cotton-mill, which used to employ them, was bought and closed some years ago by (we were told) a British cotton-combine. The population as a whole has given up hope, as is shown by the fact that 56.6 per cent. of the families in Mariental have no children, and 26.3 per cent. only one child. Nothing, indeed, is more noticeable about the place than the absence of children, final proof of an age dead and damned, and of a godless social and industrial system.

The work on the allotments which are to bring a steady if meagre food supply to these needy men and their families was sufficiently strenuous. In order to satisfy the conditions under which the Austrian Government pays the men the temporary dole we all had to do forty-two hours a week, which is, of course, very little for unskilled labour. However, the Austrians did not wish to work on Saturdays at all, and this meant that we must do eight hours on three days a week, and nine on two. The sun was overpoweringly fierce and strong, indeed almost of tropical quality; and the digging up of what appeared to be virgin prairie-land was heavy labour under such conditions. The enterprise

resulted in the preparation of a large number of plots for sowing, and in a demand for another English team next year of at least one hundred members. It may be remarked that the Austrians have a very friendly feeling towards Great Britain, whence (they told us) they originally got their Christianity and their culture. The Prince of Wales is an almost legendary hero amongst them. After we had been at work a few days at Mariental, one of our Austrian unemployed fellow-workers said to me, 'We love the English.'

But Franciscan reconciliation work with Austria is comparatively easy, if only because of this friendly feeling which already exists for England. A number of us felt that the same method must be tried in relation to Germany. It was difficult at first to discover an opening; but eventually we received a warm invitation to help with the harvest work at a Protestant religious community settled on the land not far from Frankfort. It is a community numbering eighty in all, including ten families with numerous children and a large group of young people. They farm 240 acres, of very poor land, situated amongst glorious forests in the crater of an ancient volcano. They believe that a full Christian life demands still, as it did in the first age of the Church, a common purse, a common table, and the sharing of work. They live under very Spartan conditions, and work exceedingly hard, rising often at three in the summer. But as we lived amongst them, we found them to be actuated by a very deep and Christlike spirit of fellowship. The whole common life of the place centres round its religious worship, which takes place after the midday meal and at greater length in the evening and on Sundays. This worship is free in character, and is conducted on a basis of silence. There is a great deal of singing, which springs up spontaneously from time to time, in a rather remarkable way, both during meal-times and at work. The community lives, in these difficult times, in daily dependence on God, and has proved again and again that His blessing and care watch over them.

Our team was received here with the very greatest kindness and affection. It was a remarkable experience to find this welcome in a country against which there are still so many hostile feelings amongst English people. We worked hard in the fields, and on wet days at threshing corn and other kindred jobs. As we did so, we realized in action that we were all living together in a new world-order of constructive friendship, under the guidance of the Spirit of Christ. On our last evening, when

we were to say farewell, our friends brought us far on our way through the forest, with many torches, to the steep rim of the ancient crater in which their settlement is situated. As they went, they sang. We separated at last upon the edge. Looking back from far below we saw them still standing above, with their torches held high ; and we heard the sound of their singing coming down to us. It was like a glimpse of Heaven.

The method of Franciscan action for peace is not only practical and effective in the national problems of Europe. It has been tried out also, and with striking success, in the sphere of the relationships between East and West. In the autumn of 1934 M. Pierre Ceresole, the Swiss educationist who has been responsible, more than any other man, for the development of the idea of 'reconciliation by pick and shovel' during the post-war years, led a small team of Europeans to help with the task of reconstructing villages destroyed by the earthquake which took place in Northern India on January 15th, 1934. They went to work with their hands amongst the Indian peasants, first at the task of raising the level of houses, in order to get them beyond the reach of floods, by carrying earth to build platforms upon which the houses were re-erected : and secondly, at the task of removing and rebuilding whole villages. The British Government in India, and the Indian National Congress—bodies which have not invariably worked together in the fullest concord, the latter was indeed outlaw till a short time before the earthquake—co-operated effectively in furthering the work of the Ceresole Team. Large amounts of money were granted by each body, for the purchase of land for the new villages, and for similar purposes ; and appeals were issued by the President of the National Congress, and by Mr. Gandhi for the young people of India, to follow the example set them of hard work with the hands for the distressed.

The conditions under which this Indian work was done were exceedingly severe. The European volunteers were living amongst the peasants, and as far as possible on the same basis as they. They found agricultural wages paid in kind, to the extent of three tumblersfuls of rice for a man and his family after a hard day's work. They found appalling ignorance, shocking lack of sanitation, a radically vicious landholding system, tyranny and corruption, unchecked disease, a permanent state of semi-starvation, and other glaring evils. But they brought to bear on this dark situation the method of brotherhood through shared manual work, without hope of reward to themselves ; and

the results were strikingly encouraging, not so much from the point of view of the amount of work done, though this was considerable, and will be much more considerable, as from the point of view of the establishment of genuinely human relationships with the unfortunate earthquake victims. At first, for instance, they were called 'Sahib' (master), but soon this changed to 'Bhai' (brother). The barrier of language was overcome, largely by means of laughter and song ; and a relationship of jovial familiarity was established with the people for whom and with whom the European team was working.

As in the case of all Franciscan work, it may be objected that such activities are a mere drop in the bucket. How do they affect the main problem of poverty and despair, whether in India, in Germany, in Austria, or in South Wales ? The answer is that in the sphere of psychological and spiritual relationship there is no counting by heads. Galilee was a small and backward district in the great Roman Empire. The leper-house outside Assisi was a wholly unimportant spot in early thirteenth-century Europe. The root-idea of Franciscan service is that you work with your hands for the needy and the dispossessed without reward and *without worrying about results*. The only thing that matters is that we should be in action, doing our duty with spade or scrubbing-brush, in the spirit of the sacrament of the feet-washing. God will look after the rest. Results are with Him.

To an age which is rapidly losing any sense of purpose or worth-whileness in living, and is therefore hastening headlong towards suicide, the message of Francis comes with saving power. If you want to get your own psychology right, relieved of tangling complexes and egotisms, go and work with a spade on the allotment of a disabled or unemployed miner ; or, if you are a woman unequal to work on the land, help his wife scrub her floors, make her beds, wash her clothes (this latter type of work was done with great success by the women members of the English team in Austria during the summer of 1935). If you are eager to strike a blow for international peace, and to lessen the likelihood that you and your family will perish horribly in some holocaust from the air, go and do the same in some potential enemy country. If you are anxious about the industrial situation at home, and feel it laid upon your conscience to do something for inter-class reconciliation, go and do the same amongst the unemployed in your own district.

This brings us to the subject of 'reconciliation by pick and shovel' in England. The movement is young. It originated in a Work Camp held by the above-mentioned M. Pierre Ceresole at Brynmawr, a hard-hit ex-coal-mining centre in South Wales, during the summer of 1931. A team of some sixty students helped a local group of unemployed men in making a swimming-bath and a park for the town of Brynmawr. Thus started, the movement spread rapidly. The community-service side of its activities has been cared for by an organization called the International Voluntary Service for Peace, with headquarters in Leeds. The I.V.S.P. has held a number of Work Camps, which have helped to make football grounds, gardens, paddling-pools for children, and other amenities. In addition to such activities, a very large number of Work Camps have been held with the object of learning the lot of the dispossessed from within, and of helping them to increase their family food supply. The big English public schools, and the universities, have had numerous teams of schoolboys and students (both men and women) at these Work Camps. The organization is very simple. There are now (September 1935) nearly one hundred places scattered over England and Scotland where groups of unemployed men working allotments or co-operative farms will welcome teams of schoolboys or students to help them with rough digging and other forms of labour. Holiday after holiday increasing numbers of teams go from the schools and universities to do this work. The teams are billeted in the homes of the unemployed men, as paying guests, the amount paid being 3s. 6d. a day each. The billets are carefully chosen by the secretary of the local allotment association for unemployed men. The teams ask to be put to work on the plots of men unable to work their own ground by reason of the effects of malnutrition or accident. There is always a certain proportion of such men in an unemployed allotment association. Help is also given with the roads and fences of the association, which being communal concerns sometimes get neglected. Domestic work is also done in the homes, especially, but not exclusively, by women students.

Some fifty in all of these Work Camps have been held during the summer holidays of 1935. The teams vary in size from one or two to thirty or thirty-five. The ideal number is probably eight or ten. The teams work from five to eight hours a day, and stay for a week or ten days. The facts concerning unemployment which come to light are exceedingly illuminating. A team of us were

working recently on the plot of an unemployed miner who was receiving per head of his family a daily ration well below that of the slave in ancient Greece. We have stayed in homes where the gas in the living-room had not been lit for so long that the head of the family had forgotten that the tap had been screwed down too tight to turn. We have been followed, during excavation-work on one of the rubbish-dumps so generously given by local authorities for the use of the unemployed, by little groups of women and children eager to rake through the rubbish for any cinder with power in it of being burnt. We have seen the long lines of worn-out unemployed men carrying a hundred-weight of coal each from the dumps or the outcrop—staggering perhaps a distance of miles to their homes. We have got to know *from within* what it is like to live on the dole, or on transitional benefit, under the mellowing influence of the Means Test. And we have learnt these things as friends of the family, because we have been working as their unpaid servants, on the land or in the home. Once the men see, whether in Austria, in Germany, or in England, that you are in earnest in your intention to give them your labour freely, relationships take on a new and Christian aspect. Citizens of a defeated nation, members of an exploited class, Oriental peasants, all alike become friends. Suspicions give way to cordiality. They welcome you warmly to the best they have to share. Even Governments become friendly, and (as has happened this year both in India and in Austria) loosen their purse-strings to help the people whose servants you have become.

The Franciscan method of action works like magic, if only the spirit behind the action is right. It must be the spirit of the sacrament of the feet-washing, pure from all self-seeking.

Such Franciscan service acts with converting power upon those who share in it, whether possessors or dispossessed. Letters have come from public school teams speaking of Work Camps as the happiest times they have ever known: and letters also from unemployed men's allotment associations speaking with undisguised admiration of the work done by the school teams. One such letter, received a few days ago, speaks of the joy of knowing that there are institutions which can turn out such splendid material as the school team just departing from the farm. Letters are also constantly coming in from clergymen, students, business men, well-to-do women, and others asking about openings for Franciscan service. In many cases it is possible to put them in touch with allotment associations

or co-operative farms for unemployed men in their neighbourhood, where they may work, if possible, in company with a team of one or two others of like mind with themselves. A recent encouraging development is the tendency for churches to establish co-operative farms for unemployed men in their vicinity, and for the church members to help the men in the working of the farms. Older people may be of just as much service as younger in such work; indeed, one's effectiveness in Franciscan service probably varies inversely with one's physical ability. What matters is not the amount of work to do, but the spirit in which you do it. If you have got white hair and a rheumatic hobble, the fact that you are there working in a gang on the land with the men, or scrubbing the floor in an unemployed family's home, counts for far more than if you are young and vigorous.

The starting of such a farm is simple enough. Hire a few acres of land, and get a group of men from the Labour Exchange prepared to work it with you. Expert advice—all too much of it—may be obtained from County Councils, local authorities, or the host of candid friends who will spring up to admonish you. Each labour-hour put in on the farm is a share: and dividends are paid, in kind (*i.e.* in the produce of the farm), at intervals as frequent as possible in accordance with the number of shares held. A trained leader, skilled in dealing both with men and vegetables, is essential.

He will be paid, but as little as possible above the amount received by the men on the dole, which means that he will be doing the work as a vocation and not to make money. His salary will be a charge on the subscription list which you must organize to pay the overhead expenses of the farm, rent, tools, seeds, and so forth.

On one such farm, after six months of working, the eleven men engaged in farming seven acres were making twelve shillings apiece of extra food-value per week. This, of course, represents an exceedingly important addition to the miserable food-supply of the average unemployed family.

A Franciscan revival in our country would mean the enormous reduplication of such farms, and of allotment associations for unemployed men. It would mean a Church redeemed into Christianity, with its bourgeois past behind it and a proletarian future ahead. It would mean the torpedoing both of Capitalism and of Communism by a spirit rejecting what the Franciscans call the 'proprium,' the grabbing of profit and advantage either for individual or class. It would mean the solving of the problem of international and inter-racial friction, and therefore the prevention of the threatened sudden destruction of mankind by war; for it would mean the bringing of a new spirit and a new relationship between the nations,\* based on individual acts of labour-service.

'If you understand these things, happy are you if you do them.'

## Some Outstanding New Testament Problems.

### Epilogue.

BY PROFESSOR VINCENT TAYLOR, Ph.D., D.D., WESLEY COLLEGE, HEADINGLEY, LEEDS.

I am writing this Epilogue at the request of the Editors, and my claim to do so is an intense interest in the Series before its appearance and throughout its course. It would be presumptuous to attempt to assess the value of the various essays, but it would be artificial to conceal an appreciation for them all, and for some of them in particular. My summary comments may, I hope, lead some readers to consider the Series afresh, and may even persuade them to read either the whole or certain parts of it again. Not a small virtue in the Series is that it takes us into the investigator's study, so

that we are permitted to look over his shoulder, to watch his experiments, glance at his notebooks, and examine his tentative conclusions. But its principal value is its suggestiveness, and it is much to be hoped that it will lead others to take up some of these problems and carry them a stage further towards solution. The need for this is great, for it may be said of New Testament Introduction, as of many spheres of hard toil, that the fields are white unto harvest, but the labourers are few.

With a single exception, all the articles have dealt with problems connected with the Gospels.

This, no doubt, is a weakness, but if we are to judge the Series by what it omits, a great deal might be said. The only remedy is to provide other groups of articles; the discussion of many important doctrinal passages, for example, like Ro 3<sup>25f.</sup>, would provide an invaluable discipline. The exception to which I have referred is Professor G. S. Duncan's article, 'The Epistles of the Imprisonment in Recent Discussion.' This article is especially welcome because, in his *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* (1929), he has introduced into Great Britain an interesting discussion, carried forward on the Continent by A. Deissmann, W. Michaelis, M. Goguel, and others, regarding the date and the place of composition of Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians. Among those who do not reject the Ephesian hypothesis in its entirety, there is considerable agreement that Professor Duncan has proved his case, so far as such contentions can be proved, in respect of Philippians. I doubt if further agreement as regards Colossians and Philemon can be long delayed, and there would be an advantage in separating Ephesians from Colossians by a time-interval, if it proves impossible, after further study, to date the former so early as A.D. 55.

In turning to the articles on the Gospels, I begin with a reference to Professor T. W. Manson's essay, 'The Problem of Aramaic Sources in the Gospels.' The reception given to C. C. Torrey's *The Four Gospels*, and the discussions which have followed, have revealed the deep interest taken in this subject, and it is most useful to have Professor Manson's suggestions and his survey of the present position. His opinion that the problem concerns sources, rather than Gospels, confirms a steadily growing conviction. One point in his article is of special interest to me, in view of the unfavourable opinion I expressed in the essay on 'The Elusive Q' about the theory of different recensions. Dr. Manson has now put forward what is in substance a new theory of early recensions of Q, and the question will call for renewed consideration. But his suggestion is the theory of recensions with an important difference. He does not merely posit two recensions, one used by Luke and the other by Matthew, but adds the interesting suggestion that the one used by Matthew was a Greek version revised 'with reference to the original Aramaic.' I am sure that we shall all await with keen anticipation the forthcoming work in which Dr. Manson tells us he has set out his views in detail.

One other point may be referred to among the

many valuable suggestions in this important essay, and that is the dark allusion to the studies of the Manchester Hellenistic Seminar, concerning which, Professor Manson says, he is 'dependent on oral tradition.' Most of us have not even this knowledge, and one is tempted to say that it would greatly advance scientific investigation if, at least the conclusions and suggestions of such Seminars, whether at Oxford, Manchester, or Birmingham, could be placed in the hands of isolated students by means of publication in such journals as THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Professor F. C. Grant's article, 'Further Thoughts on the M-Hypothesis,' fills a serious gap in our knowledge of this source (or sources). It tells us of the antecedents of the view put forward by Canon Streeter eleven years ago in his *Four Gospels*, as well as of the researches now proceeding in the United States of America. Professor Grant goes so far as to say that 'vastly more students have taken the M-hypothesis seriously since he (Streeter) wrote,' and that 'it is gaining in general recognition every year.' His opinion is also worthy of note that it 'may throw more light upon the origin of the Gospel of Matthew than any hitherto advanced, not excluding patristic hypotheses.' The article literally contains 'further thoughts,' for it reveals a much greater confidence in the hypothesis than Dr. Grant held when he wrote his *Growth of the Gospels* two years ago (cf. pp. 9, 14, 63, 190). This is just as it should be, for no progress can be made in Synoptic Criticism if scholars are to be tied down to doubts they may have previously expressed regarding any hypothesis.

After the essays on Q and M it is natural to turn to those on the L source used by Luke. Professor J. M. Creed's article, '"L" and the Structure of the Lucan Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis,' deals mainly with the topic indicated by its sub-title. For the most part it is an attack on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, or rather on that part of it which concerns Luke's Passion-narrative. As I have already intervened in the debate on this subject (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlvi. 236-8, 379), I will content myself here with emphasizing the importance of the problem and the need for further investigation. Form-critics are at one in describing the Passion-narrative as the earliest piece of continuous narrative; and it is essential to try to discover whether Mk 14-16<sup>8</sup> is the only connected story which criticism can recover, or whether other accounts have been used by the Evangelists. That Luke used an independent source is argued by Professor A. M. Perry in his article, 'Luke's Dis-

puted Passion-Source.' This essay is particularly welcome, inasmuch as his scholarly investigation, *The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative*, is too little known in Great Britain, and I imagine that many will want to read the larger work, as well as the paper on 'The Framework of the Sermon on the Mount' to which reference is made in the July number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (xlvi. 440 f.).

While the Passion narrative has received considerable attention in recent research, the tradition relating to the Resurrection has been somewhat neglected, and the article of the Bishop of Truro, 'The Problem of the Resurrection Narratives,' brings home to us how little has been done in this field since Kirsopp Lake's *Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ* (1907). It may be that this neglect is due to the thoroughness of Lake's work, but his book raises many challenging issues, and the further development of nearly thirty years of Gospel Criticism surely points to the need of a fresh investigation comparable in method to Goguel's *La foi à la résurrection de Jésus dans le christianisme primitif* (1933).

The remaining article on the Synoptic Gospels is Professor F. B. Clegg's essay, 'The Trustworthiness of the Marcan Outline.' It is a very timely discussion, in view of Professor Lightfoot's recent endorsement, in his *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, of Wrede's theory regarding the manner in which Mark has applied the idea of the Messianic Secret in the construction of his Gospel. The surprising thing in this book is the author's failure to discuss the strong arguments brought against Wrede's hypothesis by W. Sanday, A. S. Peake, J. Weiss, and A. E. J. Rawlinson; and it is the merit of Professor Clegg's article that he so effectively supplies this deficiency. In this connexion it is also useful to recall the suggestive article on 'The Framework of the Gospel Narrative' which Professor C. H. Dodd contributed to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES in June 1932 (xliii. 396-400). These essays, together with the observations of the late F. C. Burkitt in the April number of the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1935, provide a convincing reply to the view that Mark's outline is a doctrinal construction and, as such, is untrustworthy. It may be that, with advantage, the Series might have included a discussion of *Formgeschichte*, but English readers now have the advantage of the translation of Dibelius's *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums in From Tradition to Gospel*, and also of Dr. Grant's translation of two essays by Bultmann and Kunds in his *Form Criticism*. The suggestiveness, as well as the

limitations, of the new method are by now becoming clearly evident, and, with its characteristic emphasis upon the practical side of things, British scholarship appears to be interested most in the repercussions of Form Criticism upon the historical value of Mark's Gospel.

A Series in itself might at any time be devoted to the problems of the Fourth Gospel; it will be agreed, however, that Professor W. F. Howard's article goes to the centre of things in its treatment of 'The Johannine Sayings of Jesus.' Many people still continue to quote these sayings as if they came from the Sermon on the Mount, and others hesitate to quote them at all, except as illustrating the Evangelist's theology. In these circumstances there can be perhaps no more urgent task than the one faced in this essay. The strength of Dr. Howard's discussion is, I think, his insistence on the importance of the Jewish background implied by the sayings, and his contention that 'it is becoming unscientific lightly to dismiss the mysticism of the Fourth Gospel as an anachronism upon the lips of Jesus.' It is an excellent practical suggestion of his that we should analyse the main thoughts in the Johannine discourses, and compare them with parallel thoughts in the Synoptic Gospels and the Old Testament. It is also interesting to compare what he has to say on the possibility of an Aramaic source lying behind some of the sayings with similar observations in Professor Manson's article. Indeed, it is a marked feature of the Series that teachers of the New Testament are emphasizing the need, in the criticism of the Gospels, of co-operation with Hebrew and Aramaic scholars, and of a thorough knowledge of the theology of the Old Testament.

The three remaining articles treat the wider problems connected with the teaching and person of Jesus. I imagine that Professor Flew's article 'Jesus and the Kingdom of God,' would come as a surprise to some readers, for there is a widespread opinion that at least this question has been worked out as far as the data permit us to go. Was not Jesus thinking of a community or realm when He spoke of ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ? Dr. Flew shows how severely present-day research is challenging this assumption, and is insisting that the 'Kingdom of God' is the 'Rule of God,' a 'Rule' which is something more than an inner spiritual experience, quite different from the idea of a *summum bonum* sought by man, and distinct from the embodiment it finds in the Church. Already the correspondence in this Journal has shown that the new interpretation has its difficulties. The Rev. J. G. Radford has

reminded us that in Mark the Kingdom can be *entered* (10<sup>23ff.</sup>), and that one can be *not far from it* (12<sup>34</sup>), while in Q it is 'something men *enter*, that can be *closed against* men, from which they may be *cast out*, and in which they may *sit down*' (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlvi. 427). It is clear that before one can accept the view that the *βασιλεία* is the 'Rule of God,' it will be necessary to examine all the relevant sayings and parables afresh, in the light of the Old Testament teaching concerning 'the Living God,' and, in particular, to consider whether Gloege is right in his *Reich Gottes und Kirche* in contending that the phrases mentioned above are figurative expressions, perhaps derived from parables, and not to be treated as details in an allegory (cf. *op. cit.*, 54). Without attempting to enter into these questions here, it is true to say that the contentions of Dr. Flew's article serve to re-open some of the most ultimate of the questions which concern Jesus and His Mission, including the doctrines of the Atonement, Christian Perfection, and the Church. The interpretation of the title 'Son of Man' also calls for renewed study, especially in view of the fascinating suggestions of Rudolf Otto in his *Das Reich Gottes und Menschensohn*.

The closing section of Professor G. H. C. Macgregor's article, 'John the Baptist and the Origins of Christianity,' after his exposure of the vagaries of Eisler's *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, also takes up the subject of the teaching of Jesus. It emphasizes the idea that for Jesus the Kingdom is 'God's free gift.' 'According to John, the initiative in the drama of salvation must be taken by man's repentance: according to Jesus, it belongs to God's grace.' The first condition of entrance into the Kingdom is God's free pardon, and the Messiah is the instrument in bringing in the Kingdom. The essence of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus was His sense of the Divine call to be God's representative in mediating this pardon, and 'it was in answer to that call that He went to the Cross.' It is interesting to recall these opinions, especially when one turns from them to the next article, 'The Historical Jesus: A Study of Schweitzer and After,' written by Professor C. J. Cadoux.

Packed with valuable information, this essay lacks some of the distinctive notes in the two articles just mentioned, but it raises vital questions and brings us to the threshold of important developments. It shows how impossible it is to return to the so-called 'liberal' picture of Jesus, and it seeks to deal honestly with the truth in the eschatological theory. The method adopted is

that of boldly recognizing development in the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, and of distinguishing *stages* in its unfolding. Professor Cadoux recognizes that a frank acceptance of the eschatological teaching 'involves the acknowledgement of some intellectual error in Jesus,' but maintains that this error is limited to the *form* which He expected His triumph to take. First, he describes an early stage during which Jesus 'looked forward to the cataclysmic coming of the Judgment and the Kingdom as imminent events which would not be preceded by His own earthly death.' He insists, however, on the importance of the political aspects of the Mission of Jesus, and claims that 'far too much has been read into Jesus' representation of the Kingdom as God's gift, as if that representation implied that man was powerless to do anything to realize the Kingdom.' The next stage is one of disillusionment followed by triumphant hope. Growing opposition ousts Jesus' early hopes of success, and martyrdom is accepted because it can be avoided only by silence, flight, or resistance. Hence His frequent references to the political fate of Israel and His belief that He would be vindicated by Divine power. 'The murdered Messiah would not only live again, but He would live in glorious triumph.' These hopes were fulfilled in the rise of the Church. Jesus, however, apparently pictured the fulfilment as a visible and speedy reappearance of Himself, and the predictions of the Resurrection were in the first place predictions of His Parousia.

I hope this bald summary does no injustice to the views of Professor Cadoux. Its strong, simple lines are obvious, but the question arises whether it does not over-simplify the problem. Without entering into any detailed discussion, I will content myself with noting several points which, I think, call for fuller consideration in current research. (1) The extent to which the delimitation of stages in the thought of Jesus helps the investigation, since, as in the treatment of Professor Cadoux, the stages overlap. (2) The place of the eschatological element in the teaching of Jesus, and the modifications He introduced into the current doctrine. (3) The significance of the term 'Son of Man,' as Jesus used it, and the bearing it has upon His relation to the coming of the Kingdom. (4) The conception of the Kingdom implicit in the teaching of Jesus. (5) The sayings which define His attitude to His Messianic Sufferings and Death. Differences of opinion in the Series upon these and other questions in no way call for surprise, and indeed are an incentive to further study. I would also add that the considerable amount of agreement in a

group of articles, written without collaboration and in entire independence, is an outstanding feature, and an indication that real progress is being made. One wonders how a similar Series, written in five or ten years' time, will read, and what further progress will then be evident. Meantime, the contributors of the present articles will be amongst

those most eager to sit at the feet of their Old Testament colleagues in studying the essays on 'Some Outstanding Old Testament Problems,' for nothing is more clear than the fact that the secret to further advance in solving the enigmas of Gospel research, so far as they bear on the thought and teaching of Jesus, lies in the sacred books of Israel.

## In the Study.

### Virginibus Puerisque.

'Babel Reversed.'

### Address for Armistice Sunday.

BY THE REVEREND S. GREER, M.A., AYR.

'Seek peace and pursue it.'—I P 3<sup>11</sup> (Weymouth).

I WANT to tell you something about pirates. These ones don't fly the Jolly Roger, or swagger like Captain Hook. But villainous pirates they are all the same, and they behave in a particularly cold-blooded way. For these fierce little hunting-spiders will weave a few tiny twigs into a raft, and sail up and down some convenient pond, keeping a sharp look-out for any insect that is drowning. When they see some unfortunate creature, they pick it out of the water, and calmly proceed to eat it.

These are not the only villains in the world of tiny creatures. There's the bombardier beetle. When he is fighting another beetle he lets fly a jet of liquid which goes off in the air, and explodes with a bang. His opponent, blinded by the nasty stuff and deafened by the noise, runs off in terror. Then there's the ant-lion which lies at the bottom of a tiny sand-pit, and pelts with sand any unwary ant that crawls over the edge, until his poor victim loses its foothold and rolls down into his clutches.

Many little creatures have to fight to protect themselves. We don't blame them. It is their nature to fight. But when it comes to human beings, it is another matter altogether. God has not given us claws or fangs or stings to destroy one another: He has given us minds to understand each other. And when men use poison-gas, or kill one another with bombs, they're copying the lower animals. Fighting has, alas, had to be done sometimes in the past. But in the future we must rather try to learn to know one another better. If we do, we shall find what multitudes of delightful

folk there are in the world, even though they don't talk a single word of English.

At a Swiss holiday resort I once saw a charming thing. A Scots lady sat with a German lady in the hotel garden with their children, when the two were joined by Louis, a little French boy. A game of 'Hide-and-Seek' was suggested for the children, but none of them understood a word of each other's language. Then the Scots lady by dumb-show indicated what was meant, whereupon the French and German children excitedly yelled out the name of the game as they knew it. A moment later the flying legs were bearing them to distant corners of the garden, and delighted shrieks in several different languages proclaimed that one or other was 'spied.' A juvenile League of Nations! The confusion of the Tower of Babel was reversed, and everybody understood everybody else!

But what about ourselves? What are we to say when young folk are quarrelsome, and make nasty remarks, and cruel words are going off with a bang, and bad feeling is poisoning the air? A quarrel looks so ugly when you see it without being in it, doesn't it? It's just as ugly when other see it, and we're in it. Little snappings and snarlings—isn't it dreadful that any one could ever so far forget oneself?

Let us 'seek peace and pursue it.' Let the strong gentleness of Jesus dwell in our hearts. What was it He said? 'Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the children of God.'

### The Owl and the Starlings.

BY THE REVEREND G. SHERIFF JOHNSON, HITCHIN.

'Let us consider one another.'—Heb 10<sup>24</sup>.

Some time ago the daily newspaper gave a most interesting account of a happening at Bourton-on-

the-Water, in Gloucestershire. Some farm workers saw an owl fly out of an apple tree into the midst of a flight of starlings, seize one of the starlings and carry it to the ground. Instantly, as though obeying an order, the starlings turned and flew to the help of their comrade. They beat the owl with their wings, until at last it was bound to let the captured starling escape. It is worth our while thinking about that incident. Instead of flying on, thankful that they had escaped the owl, the rest of the starlings came to the assistance of their companion.

I think those starlings would fly away feeling as happy as it is possible for birds to be. In his *Cloister and the Hearth*, Charles Reade tells of a young man who saved his comrade from drowning. When they got out of the water to the river bank they looked at one another from head to foot as if eyes could devour, then by one impulse flung each an arm round the other's neck, and panted there with hearts too full to speak. And at that sacred moment life was sweet as heaven to both. 'To save a human life; and that life a loved one. Such moments are worth living for,' says Charles Reade, 'ay, threescore years and ten.'

Helping a comrade in difficulty and danger is a Christlike thing. Our Lord would have us think not of our own things but of others. He bade the strong help the weak. Once a Salvation Army girl officer was brought before the magistrates in Manchester charged with obstructing the traffic. She had been preaching about Jesus, and rough men had made game of her; and now she stood forlorn before her judges. Then one of the magistrates, Frank Crossley, came down from the Bench and stood by her side at the bar all through her trial. How comforted and strengthened she must have been! Who taught Frank Crossley to do that? Jesus. It was the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ in His disciple. And if we are taught of Jesus we shall stand by the weak, we shall be ready to help those who are in trouble, we shall be kind to all.

The story of the starlings helps us to understand the value of co-operation. One starling was helpless against the owl, but the whole flock of them were able to overcome him. It is because we can do unitedly what we cannot do separately that we join together in the Band of Hope, Boy Scouts, and Girl Guides, and in the Church of Christ. I heard the other day of a little three-year-old who said: 'When I grow up, I'm going to be a Boy-Sprout.' I hope his wish will be fulfilled if it means training himself to help and serve others. It is because Christians unite together in the Church of

Christ that the gospel is sent to people living without its comfort and peace and life. We are fond of the words 'my' and 'mine,' but Jesus teaches us to turn 'my' into 'our'—'Our Father, our daily bread, our sins, our temptations.' To learn the lesson of living for others is to discover the secret of happy life.

The owl and the starlings remind us that we have enemies who will try to destroy us. We need help to resist them and to escape them. It is a great thing to have a friend who will stand by you in the hour of need and add his strength to yours. Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is such a Friend. He will stand by us in temptation and danger and give us strength to escape. He will also give us His own chivalrous spirit to stand by others who are in need of help.

### The Christian Year.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Jesus as the Champion of the Individual.

'There shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repented.'—Lk 15<sup>7</sup> (R.V.).

'One sinner!' Not 'one saint!' Not even 'one good man.' There is joy in heaven over even a bad man saved. Every individual soul is of priceless worth in the sight of God, and so there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repented.

Sir John Seeley entitles one of the chapters in his *Ecce Homo* 'The Enthusiasm of Humanity.' There is much that is wise and good in the chapter. But the title is somewhat unfortunate and misleading. He says that this was one of the things which Christ came to foster in His followers—this enthusiasm for Humanity. We do not forget that he defines this 'enthusiasm of Humanity' as the love not of the race or of the individual, but of the race *in* the individual. Nevertheless the phrase, even when so qualified, suggests a temper remote from the spirit of Christ. It is far easier to be enthusiastic about Humanity with a capital H than it is to be enthusiastic about the individual man. We can idealize Humanity. We can look at it in the abstract. We can think of its great and splendid achievements in the course of the generations, and we can quite easily conjure up some sort of enthusiasm of Humanity. That is exactly what Auguste Comte and the Positivists did—they established what they called a Church of Humanity, and made Humanity the object of their worship and their service.

The modern Humanistic movement does very

much the same thing. Mr. Lippman, having got rid of God, puts in His place what he calls the 'Great Society.' But the test of any real enthusiasm of humanity comes in our attitude towards the individual man and our estimate of the individual man. And not simply towards some picked man or men. It is easy enough to be enthusiastic about a General Booth or a Nansen. But what about the average man, and even the bad man? Christ believed that every one of them was of infinite worth to God. And that sense of the worth of the individual personality, that enthusiasm for man as man stands expressed in this text—'There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth.' That is the distinctively Christian note—not the 'enthusiasm of Humanity,' but enthusiasm for man as man. It would do us all good if we gave these abstract nouns—Humanity and Society and Civilization, and their like—a rest for a while. After all, Humanity and Society are made up of individual men and women. Let us get down out of the nebulous abstract into the concrete and the real. The question is not, have we an enthusiasm of Humanity, but what is our attitude towards the individual men and women in the midst of whom we live? Some of them are mean, and some are base, and some are soiled, and some are vile, but we have not shared in Christ's spirit until our love reaches down even to these, and we believe every one of these to be of supreme and infinite worth.

In saying all this we are not in line with the stream of modern thought. We are living in collectivist days. The individual has become merged and lost in the teeming city, the masses, unions, combines, and trusts. He has ceased to count. He is just one of the herd! Even in our thoughts of reform and betterment, it is aggregated life that is important in men's eyes, and little interest is taken in the human unit. We are concerned, not with individual men and women, but with big things like the 'economic system,' and 'the social and political order.' 'To rescue an individual here and there,' says Dr. Jefferson, 'seems a pottering, paltry occupation, and to alter the structure of Society, the framework of the world, is counted the only business worthy the efforts of a full-statured, far-visioned man.'

We all know that our social practices need altering and our social order needs changing, and that environment does exercise great influence upon the development of character. All the same, when men stress the community and neglect the individual, they are certainly reversing the New Testament order. Jesus had His social vision—

but He practised the individual method. He has been called 'the Champion of Personality' and not 'Personality' in the abstract—He was the Champion of the individual *person*. Nobody ever dreamed till Jesus came that the slave in the sight of God was as precious as Cæsar. Isn't there a story that one of the most magnificent diamonds in the world—a jewel which is now the most flashing gem in a monarch's crown—once lay for a long time in a shop in a street in Rome, labelled 'Rock crystal—price one franc'? It lay there until some expert in precious stones came along and recognized in what was regarded as worthless rock crystal a gem beyond price. And so exactly the jewel of the soul for generations lay unheeded and unregarded until Jesus came—the soul which is in every man, in the poor as well as in the rich; in the unlearned as well as in the gifted; in the woman who was a sinner as well as in Mary the holy mother—which soul makes every individual man and woman unspeakably precious to the heart of God.

We want to recover this sense of the supreme worth of man as man which was so characteristic of Jesus for various reasons.

In the first place, we want it in order that we may preserve our self-respect in face of the vastness of the material universe. That is the danger of the revelations of the immensities of space and time which modern science has given us—the danger that in face of this vastness we should feel dwarfed into complete and absolute insignificance. It was hard enough to maintain one's sense of the value of the individual when our world was supposed to be the centre of the universe. It is infinitely harder when we know that our little earth is no bigger than the millionth part of a grain of sand in comparison with the vast universe of which it is a part. But we must refuse to be bullied by bulk. It is personality that invests the world with meaning. In a sense, the world might just as well not exist at all, if man were not here to understand it. The winds might blow and the mighty waves of the sea beat in thunder upon the shore or break in gentle ripples upon the beach, but there would be no ear to hear them. The flowers might bloom and the birds might sing, but there would be no heart to be gladdened by them. The waters of Niagara might fling themselves into the chasm below, the Matterhorn might still lift its spear-head summit into the sky, but there would be no soul to be moved to awe and worship. It would be a world of mere things, and of dead things, and of unconscious things. It is man with his mind, who can give meaning to a universe which is all

unconscious of itself. So let us 'stand upon our feet' and remember that our real value is what we are worth to Almighty God. And the message of Jesus is just this, that even the humblest of men is of infinite worth to God.

In the second place, we want to recover our Lord's sense of the value of the individual because that and that alone will make our labour for the individual seem worth while. If we are to labour for the salvation of individuals we must have Christ's sense of the individual's worth. We remember what Myers says about St. Paul as he stood in front of a congregation. There were all sorts and conditions of people in the throng, but Paul had no eyes for their differences of condition. 'Only like souls I see the folk thereunder.' 'Like souls!' To see them so is to realize their worth. Griffith John, the great Chinese missionary, in an address he gave at the Jubilee Meetings of the Congregational Union at Manchester, thrilled a great audience which filled the Free Trade Hall, by declaring that he would think it worth while to labour for aeons and aeons if God made him the means of saving one Chinese soul. That was the authentic Christian note.

And thirdly, we want to recover our sense of the worth of the individual because we believe it is only through regenerate individuals we shall realize the Kingdom of God. This truth lies at the root of the great ameliorations which the centuries have brought, and it has been behind all the movements for social betterment. Oppressions and injustices are possible when personality is little esteemed. But a sense of the value of the individual makes anything like oppression and injustice indecent. Men cannot do wrong or treat harshly a 'brother for whom Christ died.' That is why we have a secret dread of the emphasis laid in these days upon Society, upon anything that depresses or even hides the worth of the individual. But in another and deeper sense, the regenerate individual is the key to the redeemed Society. In the long-run the only way to create the new Society is to re-create the units who compose it. The only way to build the gleaming city of God is to attend to the individual living stones that are built into it.<sup>1</sup>

#### SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT.

##### The Use of the Imagination in Religion.

'The evidence of things not seen.'—Heb 11<sup>1</sup>.

'Imagination,' said Sir Benjamin Brodie, in a presidential address to the Royal Society, 'is the

source of all poetic genius, and it has been the instrument of many of our most remarkable discoveries in science. Without the aid of imagination Isaac Newton would never have invented fluxions: nor Humphry Davy have decomposed the earths and the alkalis. Nor would Christopher Columbus have ever found another continent.'

It is the same in the world of literature. It was a fruitful observation of Coleridge that a certain 'visual image' lies buried at the root of every single word we speak and write. And he urged on his generation that an instructed and an imaginative glance at that buried and forgotten image is absolutely indispensable to him who would either think or write or read aright.

Simply to name the greatest works of genius of the ancient and modern world is to point to so many triumphs of the literary imagination. Wordsworth has said that Homer is the father of poetry because he always sings 'with his eye on the object.' That is to say, Homer always sees, and that with an intensely imaginative eye, what he forthwith sings to us. And thus it is that Homer sings to us as no other singer has ever sung—unless it is Dante. And if Dante is more to us than Homer, it is because his superb imagination was first sanctified and was then directed, not upon 'things seen and temporal,' but 'upon things unseen and eternal.'

And then our common Christian people have, in their own tongue, those two great triumphs of an evangelical imagination, *The Pilgrim's Progress* and *The Holy War*.

When we come to the highest literature of all, we find the imaginations of holy men of old taken up into the hand of the Holy Ghost and made a vehicle of divine revelation and a means of transmitting that revelation to the minds and the hearts of men.

As 'all that is within us,' as all man's mind and heart was made instrumental in the production of Holy Scripture—from Moses to John—so did imagination get her own high place from one stage of revelation to another, and from one outpouring of inspiration to another. And just as scientifically instructed men can see the past of this earth, and just as men of literature can look back ages and recognize the splendid service that imagination has performed in their world of things, so the instructed and open-eyed and imaginative student of Holy Scripture can see his favourite faculty at constant work in the revealing hand of the Spirit of grace and truth. There are whole books of the Bible of a sanctified and inspired imagination 'all compact'—for example, Job, Isaiah, Ezekiel.

And not to dwell on our Lord's parables, or on

<sup>1</sup> J. D. Jones, *Morning and Evening*, 70.

Paul's Epistles, all gleaming as they are with his sanctified genius, we come to the Book of Revelation. A book in which the heaven-illuminated imagination of that aged seer lays this shining copestone on the glorious edifice of Holy Scripture: 'Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law!'

And then, what a fundamental, and what an all-essential part does this wonderful faculty perform in all true prayer and praise. It is true we may be employing this great talent and faculty of our minds when we are not reflecting on its use: we may employ it even before we know that we possess it. But we would perform all our devotions far more intelligently and far more fruitfully if we studied all the capacities and all the possibilities of our minds, and called on 'all that is within us,' as David did, to praise and magnify the Lord.

Listen to what William Law has said to us on this matter. 'Seeing our imaginations have great power over our hearts, and can mightily affect us with their representations, it would be of great use to you if, at the beginning of your devotions, you were to imagine to yourself some such representations as might heat and warm your heart. As thus: Be still, and imagine to yourself that you see the heavens open and the glorious forms of Seraphim and Cherubim before the throne of God. Help your imagination with such passages of Scripture as these also: "I beheld, and lo, a great multitude which no man could number stood before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb." Think upon all this: see all this, till your imagination has carried you above the clouds and has placed you up in your own place—among those heavenly beings, and has made you to long to take part in their heavenly music.'

'Again, sometimes imagine that you had been one of those who joined with our Blessed Saviour when He "sang an hymn." Strive to imagine to yourself with what majesty He looked: and fancy that you had stood beside Him and had seen His face and heard His voice.'

Let us carry into all our prayers and praises that visualizing and realizing practice that Coleridge has taught us. Let us see what we say and then say what we see. When we say, 'O God!' let us see Him on whom we so call. When we say, 'for Christ's sake,' let our eyes flash faster than lightning to where He once hung on the tree; and then to where He now sits on the throne. When we say that 'our sins are ever before us,' let them be before

us. When we say, 'pardon mine iniquity, for it is very great,' let our broken hearts lie in the dust under the great aggravation of our sins.

And then, once we really begin to employ and exercise our emancipated and ennobled imagination upon Almighty God in that way, we shall never be able to lift either our imagination or our heart off Him. We shall say to ourselves continually and to all that is within us, 'to whom shall we go?' And we shall come to those other magnificent words of Saint Augustine: *Deus ubique est! et totus ubique est.* God is everywhere, and He is wholly everywhere. And then, God's presence ever with us, and His whole presence ever with us, will take possession of both our imagination and our heart, till sometimes, whether we are in the body or out of the body we cannot tell: we are now so immersed in God and He is so immersed in us.

And then, let us think of this. This—that we have our imagination in our own hand. It is in our own hand and power and choice to open and turn our inward eye as it pleases us. We can debauch and pollute our imagination till both our heart and our life are filled full with all the corruption and uncleanness of the second death. Or we can fill our imagination with visions of beauty—created and uncreated—visions of love and holiness and heaven—till we are rewarded, at last, with the Beatific Vision itself. 'While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal.'<sup>1</sup>

#### FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

##### The Advent Summons.

'And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light.'—Ro 13<sup>11, 12</sup>.

The generally accepted view of the meaning of this fine passage is that it relates directly to the second coming of Christ. There is little doubt that in the main this is correct.

But a study of the context shows that in the words before us the Apostle was not dwelling so much upon the thought that Christ might appear again at any moment as upon the thought that His previous coming had been of such wondrous benefit to mankind that the Church should ever be

<sup>1</sup> A. Whyte, *The Nature of Angels*, 18.

seeking to give fuller expression to the new and higher mode of life thus divinely revealed.

The composite metaphor in the text bears out this view, for it takes for granted that a moral warfare is proceeding in which every follower of Christ is called to engage. The phraseology is suggested by St. Paul's acquaintance with Roman military usage. He must often have watched the process of changing guard in the early hours of the morning, and it is to this that he alludes here.

'It is high time to awake out of sleep'—that is, the bugle has just sounded and the drowsy men are turning out to take their first spell of duty for the day.

'The night is far spent'—that is, the sun is rising, a new day is beginning.

'Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light'—that is to say (still keeping to the imagery of the barrack room), the occupations of the hours of night, whether sleeping or carousing, must not hold us longer; we must arm ourselves and go forth. The parenthetical statement, 'Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed,' relates specifically to what all the apostolic Church expected to follow upon the Saviour's glorious second advent. The word 'salvation' is used in its most comprehensive sense. It means the final deliverance of God's people from all the evils that beset them in this world. Believing that the night of sorrow and sin is drawing to a close they are to have done with the works of darkness—that is, the practices pertaining to the heathenism and unfaith of the age; and some of those practices were very gross—and to clothe themselves in the panoply of the gospel as true soldiers of Christ in the campaign against every form of evil.

How, then, do we stand with reference to this counsel given to people of a day long gone by and belonging to a world order so different from our own? Let us remark here that although the expectation of Christ's second coming is not as intense with us as it was with the original followers of the risen Lord, it must not be allowed to fall into the background of our thoughts. There are three reasons why we cannot afford to give it up.

First, there is nothing in the New Testament, and nothing in our knowledge of history, to encourage the view that this world is ever likely to become by means of enlightened human effort an ideal dwelling-place for human beings.

Secondly, experience does not tend to show that men are necessarily made good by improving the outside of life. There is greater capacity for

wealth production in the modern world than the ancients ever dreamed of, but men are as selfish as ever in their manner of using it and as ruthless in their material rivalries. Nay more, we have reached a point at which it must be honestly confessed that we have succeeded in acquiring a greater mastery of natural forces than we are morally fit to be entrusted with, and no greater danger threatens our civilization. Some chemist or other will by and by succeed in exploding the atom, and what then? Then there will be energy enough and to spare at the control of the mind and will of self-sufficient man; will it make him happy, generous, and kind? No, there needs something more if salvation in any true sense of the word is to be attained by mankind. There needs divine intervention to make us what we ought to be; it is human nature that needs to be re-made, not the faculties we have at command.

Thirdly, the day must come when, as the Bible assures us and science affirms, this old earth will have run its course and passed away, and the human race along with it; and, whatever be the mode of that passing, we cannot fail to be concerned with what lies beyond. Individually, we are passing now. But we shall not have done with life; that goes on, and the question of questions that we have to face is what are we making of life?

The answer to this question is that faith in Christ implies aiming at a new quality of life and in a new power. What came to the world in Jesus of Nazareth nearly two thousand years ago has to be worked out in ourselves and expressed in all our relationships. We know not how or when God will intervene to deliver us from our present bondage, but we know that He will do so, for this is His world, and He cannot forsake it; our salvation may be nearer than we think, and no follower of Christ should be so faithless as to cease to look and labour for it. The truth is always other than merely what appearances proclaim; Christ is always coming in the hearts and lives of men. He cannot be stayed, and He shall yet be manifest—perhaps more speedily and overwhelmingly than most of us dare to hope—in an invincible uprising of the latent good that slumbers in the human soul, sweeping away before it the nightmare of universal dread, and bearing on its wings to the uttermost corners of the earth a new and joyous confidence in the reign of universal fraternity and goodwill. If we believe this, we must act on it. Not even omnipotence can deliver us from our ills in spite of ourselves. Spiritual ends are attained by spiritual means, and the one force that can save and lift humanity is the Spirit of Christ

operating through the consecrated wills of the men and women who really believe in Him and are prepared to dare everything for His sake.

There is one special task to which the Church of Christ is urgently called at the present time. It is that of moralizing the group mind. We shall have to master and train the herd-instinct so that it shall become something worthier than a mere co-operation of material interests ; we must purify and ennoble the group consciousness, whether that of the nation or that of the class ; and this will be a very difficult thing to do, because the group consciousness is so largely sub-rational.

' Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.' What we would not stoop to do in the case of our next-door neighbour becomes no more reputable because done by the community as a whole and to another people. Once see this clearly, and it will make all the difference in the relations of one class with another or one people with another.

In conclusion. There are dark hours in every individual life when all that once was bright and blessed in our experience seems to us to have perished for ever without hope of resurrection. John Bunyan knew what he was talking about when he placed the Valley of the Shadow of Death after the Valley of Humiliation, for the one does commonly succeed the other ; it is when we are brought low and have our hardest battles to fight against the enemy within ourselves, the temptation to let go our grip on the great essentials of right living, that the hobgoblins of the night begin to gather round our path and we can neither fight nor fly. Bunyan's Pilgrim did not know the sound of his own voice—a most suggestive touch that, so true to life. Which self is it that we are listening to when we preach despair to ourselves in the black moments that blot out the memories of past joys ; is it our best self or our worst ? Nine times out of ten, when a man has lost touch with high and holy things, it is his baser nature that is dictating his thoughts ; the voice that is speaking is not his real voice though it deceive him into thinking that it is his final judgment upon life ; it is a whisper from the pit of hell.

Listen, then, to this word of authority : ' Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.' The danger is not what we think it is ; it is not that we may continue in darkness for ever, but that we may prove unfaithful to the call of the morning. ' The night is far spent, the day is at hand.' The worst part of any dark experience is the feeling that it will never end.

But this is sheer delusion ; it is not the will of God that any soul should abide in the prison cell of sorrow and sin, and the two are more often found in conjunction than is commonly supposed. ' Unto you that fear my name, saith the Lord, shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings.' Every day is a new advent of Christ, every morning the refreshing beams of His love shine anew upon our waking eyes. Rise up to meet Him ; shake off the deadly deceptions which accompany loss of vision ; put on the whole armour of God, and go forth into the light.<sup>1</sup>

#### SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

##### Hope.

' Begat us again unto a living hope.'—I P 1<sup>8</sup> (R.V.).

' Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost.'—Ro 15<sup>13</sup>.

Men and women are very largely made what they are by their beliefs about the future. That is why the life of a man or a woman is so affected in their early years by the prospects which life holds out to them. Consequently hope of the future, hope of making their life a great and splendid success, of the good position, of the happy marriage, of influence over their fellows, largely makes them what they are, and affects their whole conduct, stimulates them to effort, gives them self-control and self-respect. The reason for this is that man has the power of living in two worlds—that of the present, and that of the future. So long as hope survives, he lives largely in the future life which he is going to create for himself, and this living in the future alters for good his life in the present.

One evil of our life here in this world is that to many men and women there comes a time when their soul ceases to grow on that side of it which is turned towards the future. And then the soul which is living in the present suffers and decays. The things which were so looked forward to are attained, and are found disappointing, or are found to be impossible of attainment. Experience shows that further progress in position is out of the question. The girl marries, and perhaps finds that marriage does not bring the expected happiness. So long as hope exists, men and women live healthily. When hope dies they are only half living.

Now the Lord Jesus Christ knew this quite well. And, in order that men might always live healthy lives, He gives them a hope that can never die. He comes to us, and says to us : ' You cannot

<sup>1</sup> R. J. Campbell, *Vision and Life*, 35.

really live unless you are living in both the present and the future. The hopes which you have for this life are sure to die away—at least, they are limited and bound by death. I will give you a hope which looks forward beyond the grave. So that you may never cease to live in the future as well as in the present, and so that your soul may go on growing and expanding, and developing on all sides, and so that your hope of the future may affect your present life.'

Let us consider this hope which Jesus Christ can give to us.

First, it is a hope which knows no limitations. All earthly hopes are bounded by death. The man or woman who has this hope will say to death when he comes, 'Here am I. You may have my body, but you cannot have me. For I carry within me Jesus Christ, my hope. And I am going through you to the life beyond, in which my hope is centred. You may kill my body, but you can't kill my life, for it is the life of Jesus, and over that you have no power. God has said that neither death nor any other creature can separate me from His love in Christ Jesus.'

One of the great romances of missionary enterprise is the *Life of Adoniram Judson*. Judson buried his wife and his entire family in Burmah. The grave was under a hope-tree, and the heart-broken man saw a wealth of significance in that fact. 'They rest together under the hope-tree,' he says, again and again, in his *Journal* and in his letters.

Secondly, it is a hope which is quite independent of the circumstances in which our earthly life is lived. Many people seem still to think that the Christian life ought to bring a man prosperity and comfort in this life. There is really no vital connexion between the two things. Jesus Christ did not promise His people comfort here. He told them that they might have to suffer tribulation, that they would have to take up His Cross. A man, thank God, may be a Christian whose circumstances are outwardly wretched, who is torn by disease and suffering. He may have the Christian hope, though comfort and ease in this life have gone.<sup>1</sup>

It is the cross-bearer whose feet march to the rhythm of hope. Would you find the pessimist, the gloomy, fretful, hopeless critic of life? Go to the man who turns his back on life's duties and responsibilities, shuts his doors to sorrow, and refuses to become acquainted with grief. There is only One in whom hope is constant and perfect—

<sup>1</sup> W. C. Allen, *The Christian Hope*, 93.

He who carried a world's pain and sorrow and gave His heart to be broken for its sin. Where is the man so deeply sunk in sin and degradation that the Lord despairs of his redemption? Where is the spot so steeped in infamy that He will not stretch hands of healing and help over it? The philosophical optimist in his cushioned arm-chair has no hope for the vulgar mass of mankind, but the disciple who bears his cross has the secret of deathless hope. The detached theorist may regard missions as a waste of energy, but the missionary toiling through long years without gaining a single convert, and the slum sister spending her days amid squalid vice with little apparent result, know only of the joy of service and carry hope as a day-star in their hearts.

In days of baffling problems and perplexities, we tend to seek relief by turning our thoughts away from the turmoil, and building a nest for ourselves out of calm thoughts and comforting considerations. We want to be rid of the fret of it all, if only for one brief hour, and seek refuge in green pastures and still waters. But the hour of enchantment passes. The present claims us once more, and we are all unready to meet it. The hope we had so eagerly treasured evaporates. Where, then, shall we seek strength and healing? Clearly, near our Master. Such is the law of the spiritual life. It is ever the heart broken for sin and woe that hopes on and hopes ever. For the broken heart is a heart united to Christ, the Source and Sustainer of hope.

During a truce in the American Civil War, when the hostile armies sat sullenly facing each other with a field between them, a little brown bird rose suddenly from the long grass and darted skywards. There, a mere speck against the blue, it poured forth that liquid music of which the lark alone has the secret. And steely eyes melted to tears, and hard hearts grew pitiful and tender. There was a God who cared. There was hope for men.

Hope is a lark on the battlefield. It will not sing in a gilded cage. It cannot soar in an atmosphere of religious luxury. But brave souls, exposing themselves fearlessly for God and their fellow-men on the battlefield of life, hear its song and are made strong and glad.

At dawn He sent him a bird,  
Which lured from slope up to slope,  
Such singing never was heard!

The bird was Hope—  
Hope was the bird.

A star at twilight He sent,  
Which shone, and filled from afar  
His soul with peace and content.  
Hope was the star—  
The star was Hope.<sup>1</sup>

And, thirdly, what is this hope which thus looks out towards the future beyond death, and which is independent of the circumstances of this life whatever they may be? Well, it is hard to describe because it is so big. It means hope of being something far better than we now are, of being free from temptation to evil and inferior things, of being interested in and happy in all noble and lovely things. It means hope that all whom we love may be far better than they are, and that we and they should live together in much closer union than we do now. It means hope that we shall not suffer from the thought of the suffering of others. How

<sup>1</sup> E. Herman, *The Secret Garden of the Soul*, 172.

are we to describe it? We can put it into two words, Jesus Christ. He is our hope. Our hope for ourselves, for, when we have Him, then we shall be better than we are. Our hope for others, for, when they have Him, they will have happiness. He is our hope because we hope to be like Him. That would be bliss beyond compare. He is our hope because we hope to see Him.

And, lastly, when will this be? This is Advent, and the thought of Advent tells us. When He comes. When will that be?

Who knows? Perhaps to-day.

But perhaps not for another many thousand years. Then we shall die first, and hope shall vanish into sight. Then shall we be one with Him whom we hope for. And then shall we and all who are His serve Him day and night in His Kingdom, bound together, as never before, by a common life radiating from Jesus Christ, acknowledged and adored as King of kings and Lord of lords.

---

## Second International Congress of Old Testament Scholars at Göttingen, September 4-10.

BY PROFESSOR NORMAN W. PORTEOUS, M.A., B.D., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

It will be of interest to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to have some account of the Second International Congress of Old Testament Scholars which took place at Göttingen, from September 4 to 10. It is perhaps not without significance that on this occasion the place of meeting was in Germany. For it is in that land that the problem of the Old Testament has been most acutely felt in the last few years, and it is there that a battle is being fought out to which no one who is concerned for the future of the Christian religion can afford to be indifferent. It was encouraging to observe that German scholars, upon whom must inevitably rest the brunt of the present conflict, are keenly alive to the grave issues at stake. One got the impression that, in these days of crisis, while they are becoming no less exact in their thinking and writing, they are reaching a clearer understanding than ever before of the purpose and value of the study of the Old Testament. It was, moreover, a pleasure to discover the unity of aim which makes scholarship international and which is able to bridge even

confessional frontiers. Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the gathering was the fact that Protestants and Roman Catholics met on terms of cordiality and mutual respect. It was not that theological differences were suppressed, but, when they had to be expressed, it was always with the utmost forbearance and friendliness, and with the recognition of how much there was in common.

The Congress enjoyed the hospitality of the University of Göttingen, Georgia Augusta, as it is named after its founder George Augustus, Elector of Hanover, who became George II. of England. Ten countries were represented, namely, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain (including England, Scotland, and Wales), Holland, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States. The joint presidents of the Congress, who fulfilled their office with much graciousness and tact were Professor Volz of Tübingen and Professor Stummer of Würzburg. Very special mention must be made of Professor Hempel of Göttingen, the well-known Editor of the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche*

*Wissenschaft*, upon whom fell the chief burden of the arrangements. It should be added that the complete text of the lectures which were delivered is to be published in a forthcoming *Beiheft* to the *Zeitschrift für die Altestamentliche Wissenschaft*.

In addition to the lectures and discussions, a very interesting and valuable item on the programme consisted in a visit to the magnificent University Library, where a special exhibition had been arranged to illustrate the contribution of Göttingen scholars to Old Testament science. One was able to inspect manuscripts and rare works of Eichhorn and Michaelis, of Ewald, Smend, Lagarde, Bertheau, and Wellhausen, and one remembered that Lagarde's greatest follower, Alfred Rahlfs, also a Göttingen scholar, who died this year, his life's work only just completed, has given us as his legacy the first convenient critical text of the Septuagint in a truly magnificent edition. One could only reflect with amazement on the paradoxical fact that his great master, Paul de Lagarde, who devoted such self-sacrificing labour to establishing the text of the Septuagint and made the world of scholarship his debtor in many other ways, should have also written the *Deutsche Schriften*, and should be hailed now as one of the prophets of German neo-paganism.

A survey of the subjects dealt with in the various lectures gives an excellent idea of the wide field covered by Old Testament studies to-day. No serious student of the Old Testament can afford to ignore the help to understanding it which may be gained by setting it in the midst of the ancient world in which it came into being and investigating its problems by the methods of comparative religion. In a suggestive lecture Professor Eissfeldt of Halle emphasized the close relation which exists between the study of ancient times and that of the Old Testament and showed how they are of mutual benefit. He argued that for long periods of time the Old Testament is still our most valuable historical source, while at the same time it gives us an inside knowledge of the religion of Israel such as we have of none of the contemporary pagan religions. 'It is still more significant that of all the things treasured by the ancient peoples the religion of the Bible is the only one to-day which is a living force in the lives, not only of the upper classes, but of the people, and that the study of ancient times, by uniting with Biblical research, gains recognition in modern life. Only through this union does non-biblical antiquity regain its colour and life just as conversely piety founded on the Bible and Old Testament becomes conscious of its individuality in contrast to the other ideals.'

One of the most remarkable features of the present age is the wealth of archaeological discovery which is pouring in from every side. Two of the lectures were devoted to this source of our knowledge of ancient times. Rektor Bea of Rome gave an illuminating account, illustrated by lantern slides, of the excavations at Teleilat Ghassul and discussed the light they throw on the early history of Palestine. Professor W. F. Badé, Director of the Pacific School of Religion, gave a fascinating lecture on the discoveries at Tell-en-Nasbe (the ancient Mizpeh), dating the great city wall in the time of Asa (c. 900 B.C.), and showing on the screen a series of photographs which included several of the city gates, and made one look forward with keen anticipation to the eventual publication of the results of the excavations. It should be added here that one of the interesting personalities of the Congress was another American, Professor McCown, who has been in charge of the excavations at Jerash, one of the ancient caravan cities in Transjordania.

Two lectures represented the links between Hebrew thought and speculation outside Israel. Professor Staerk of Jena discussed the problem of the relation between the Paradise myth in the third chapter of Genesis and similar mythological material preserved in Parsee tradition. An interesting discussion followed in which contradictory views were expressed as to the importance of Iranian influence in this connexion. Professor Causse, the eminent French scholar from Strassbourg, pointed out that the Persian tradition was very uncertain owing to our fragmentary knowledge of it. In his own lecture Professor Causse discussed the rôle of Wisdom in the Jewish propaganda of the Persian and Hellenistic Age. He argued that it is impossible to understand the Jewish Wisdom Literature if one keeps within the lines of Hebrew tradition, and suggested that it grew up in the Jewish colonies of the Nile delta where the Jews sought to imitate the old Egyptian Sapiential Writings. He showed how the wise men were not mere speculators but were popularizers and propagandists, and how in Jewish hands the Wisdom Literature gained in depth and human appeal. It must have played a considerable part in the spread of Judaism. Professor Causse's argument did not go unchallenged. Professor Baumgartner of Basel and Dr. Rankin, one of the Scottish delegates, pled for recognition of an indigenous Wisdom Literature in pre-exilic Israel going back to the time of Solomon. Dr. Rankin in particular joined issue with the false dogma, as he styled it, that individualism is only post-exilic.

Another group of lectures dealt with questions of Text, Versions, and Philology. Professor Junker of Passau discussed inversion of consonants in the Massoretic Text as a source of error and as a factor in textual criticism. He made a very timely protest against uncritical assumptions which lead to emendation based on mere guesswork, and indicated the safeguards which ought to be observed by the scholar in his critical treatment of the text. Professor Fischer of Braunsberg gave an account of the Hebrew quotations contained in a work of the Scholastic Odo. They are almost exclusively Messianic in character and were used by him in propaganda addressed to the Jews. The quotations are interesting from the textual point of view because they are given in a form which differs frequently from the Massoretic Text. From Professor Stummer of Würzburg came a carefully reasoned plea for a more critical use of the Old Testament Vulgate. He divided the books of the Vulgate into two groups, the first comprising the books translated by Jerome from the *Hebraica Veritas*, including Tobit and Judith, the second comprising the *Psalterium Gallicanum* and the *Apocrypha*—the text of which is taken from the *Vetus Latina*. He showed the importance of studying Jerome's somewhat inconsistent methods as a translator, and the influence on his translation of the Greek Versions and the traditional Jewish exegesis. He drew attention to the problem arising from the curious fact that the books of the *Vetus Latina* incorporated in the Vulgate have a better Latinity than the books which were not so incorporated. In a discussion of F. X. Wutz's theory that the LXX was translated not directly from a Hebrew exemplar, but from an intermediate transcription-text, Professor Bertram of Giessen made the important suggestion that the problem of the relation between the Hebrew and the Greek Old Testament is not merely a matter of philology, as Wutz thought, but is also a matter of religious history. There is an intrusion into the LXX Version of ideas suggested by Hellenistic-Jewish theology, and neglect of this fact is apt to lead to grave misreading of the LXX evidence.

But not only have Old Testament texts a subsequent history which can be detected in the Versions and which is of considerable theological interest; their subsequent history (*Nachgeschichte*) can also be traced within the Old Testament itself. This was the contention of Professor Hertzberg of Marburg, who argued both for a preceding history of forms and of materials (an evident allusion to the application to the Old Testament of the *formgeschichtliche*

*Methode*, which was a favourite instrument of Gunkel's and is now proving effective in the hands of Professor Alt), and for a subsequent history which betrays its existence by numerous additions, glosses, and alterations of the text. This *Nachgeschichte*, as he called it, is of value as showing how later generations sought to adapt for their own time the Word of God addressed originally to those of a bygone age. Later writers made their additions and transformations in the belief that they too were inspired. Professor Hertzberg claimed that 'as the preceding history prolongs the Old Testament text backward, into unknown origins, so the *Nachgeschichte* makes a bridge forward, particularly towards the New Testament.' An interesting discussion followed in which, among other speakers, Professors Hans Schmidt and Eissfeldt maintained that not all cases of breaks, changes, and additions in the text indicated the work of a second hand, while Professor Alt remarked that everything said in the lecture was based on the work of Duhm, though Duhm himself would not have delivered the lecture. Professor Eissfeldt also said that one had to recognize in the Old Testament periods of different spiritual and religious value. Professor Hertzberg replied that what he had wanted to emphasize was the importance of the fact that revelation was not confined to the original texts.

In a remarkably lucid and convincing lecture Professor T. H. Robinson of Cardiff argued for the presence of cases of anacrusis in Hebrew poetry, and showed how, when this was recognized, we had in our hands a valuable instrument for the exegesis of various passages of the Hebrew text. Words which could be used in this way as anacrusis at the beginning of a line might be classified thus: (1) merely introductory words of saying; (2) interjections; (3) personal pronouns; (4) particles (adverbs and conjunctions).

A subject outside the beaten track, viz. 'the Semitic sources of "cipher" and its cognates,' was dealt with in a masterly way by Professor Rowley of Bangor, who tracked Semitic roots through the cognate languages and into Rabbinic Hebrew in a way which revealed him to be a philologist of quite unusual distinction. His lecture when published will repay the most careful study by those who are interested in the history of language and enjoy unravelling the most tangled skeins of word derivation.

Another group of lectures dealt with matters of literary and historical criticism. Professor Stevenson of Glasgow, whose subject was 'successive phases in the career of the Babylonian Isaiah,'

asked that he should be allowed to test the theory that Is 40-55 represents a collection of his utterances not made by the prophet himself, which, when rearranged and read in the light of the known history of Cyrus, provide a trustworthy clue to the successive phases of the prophet's public life. In the course of a very careful argument he put forward the interesting suggestion that ch. 41<sup>8-20</sup> may be interpreted as implying that 'Deutero-Isaiah' himself returned to Palestine in the reign of Cyrus. In the discussion which followed, doubts were expressed as to the possibility of dating the prophecies with any accuracy. Professor Stummer said that Deutero-Isaiah was the work of a preacher who had made a collection of the quintessence of his preaching and, in doing so, had taken the words out of their original context.

In a lecture on the structure of Ex 19-34, Professor Rudolph of Giessen continued the attack on the E-hypothesis which he and Professor Volz began in a recent Beiheft to *Z.A.W.* His argument, based on a careful analysis of the text, was to the effect that criticism might very well dispense with the Elohist in its attempt to explain the complicated structure of the chapters under discussion. In this view he was opposed strongly by Professor Procksch, who is one of the stoutest upholders of the E-hypothesis, and by Professor Eissfeldt, who argued for two main levels of thought in Ex 19-34, and maintained that there was a unifying thread running through the passages distinguished by Professor Rudolph as accretions to the original Jahwistic narrative.

Two lectures of very great importance were delivered by Professors Begrich and Alt, both of them clearly dominated by the *formgeschichtliche Methode*, to which allusion has been made above. Professor Begrich gave a very careful analysis of the legal type, which may be called the priestly Torah, discussing its origin, forms, and relation to the laity. Professor Alt applied the method to the Book of Joshua. He held that the narratives contained in the early chapters cannot be used as secure evidence for the historical figure of Joshua, but 'are essentially aetiological local sagas.' In the narrative and song-fragment in Jos 10, however, we have the type of the hero saga in which the name of Joshua belongs originally. The other stories about Joshua represent him 'as the founder and law-giver of the Amphictyony of Shechem. The combination of these permanent functions with temporary charismatic leadership in war is well within the bounds of historical possibility.' The lecture illustrated the way in which the scepticism of the *form-*

*geschichtliche Methode* can lead to confirmation of tradition.

Two questions concerning the history of old Jerusalem were dealt with by Professor de Groot of Groningen. His first suggestion was that Jerusalem, at the time when David captured it, was possibly a Philistine town in the sense that the Philistines were the overlords of the Jebusites. He argued that the curious text of 2 S 8<sup>1</sup> should be accepted, 1 Ch 18<sup>1</sup> being regarded as an intentional alteration. His second suggestion was that, at the time of David, Jerusalem included not only the City of David, but also part of the Western Hill, being in effect a double city. Doubts were expressed as to the correctness of both suggestions.

The last group of lectures of which some account must be given, dealt with various aspects of Old Testament theology. Professor Puukko of Helsingfors discussed the transformation of certain ideas of the Old Testament Psalms in Christian exegesis, instancing Luther's well-known version of Ps 46, and the Messianic interpretation of Ps 22, based on the fact that Jesus is reported to have used its opening words on the Cross. In the discussion which followed, Roman Catholic members spoke of the unity of the spirit which made it possible for the life, which was in a Psalm, to come up and renew itself in new circumstances. Professor Puukko in reply spoke of the *analogia fidei*, which makes the Scriptures of a bygone age relevant to the needs of to-day.

Principal Wheeler Robinson of Oxford read a very valuable paper on the idea of Corporate Personality in the Old Testament. He maintained that the Hebrew thought of the past, present, and future generations of his people as constituting a unity, and that quite realistically, not just by way of personification. It was thus natural for the Hebrew to pass at will from the community to the individual and back again without indicating expressly when he did so. The Principal then proceeded to show how this thought of corporate personality could be used to explain certain phenomena in the Old Testament, e.g. the idea of the representation of the people by King, Priest, or Prophet, the 'I' of the Psalms and of the Servant Songs, and certain main characteristics of Old Testament Ethics.

Another memorable lecture was that of Professor Lindblom of Lund, who discussed the problem of the essence of the religion of the Old Testament, one which has greatly exercised the minds of Old Testament theologians during the past fifteen years. He put forward the view that it is the Hebrew idea of God which both explains the important character-

istics of the Hebrew religion and distinguishes it from other religions. According to the Hebrew idea of God, Jahweh is King (*Melek*), and, as such, He is personal will manifesting itself in history, the chief qualities of this will being absolute holiness, love, and wrath. There is a conflict in God between His love and His wrath. His love is shown only towards those who belong to the Covenant. Those who are outside the Covenant stand under His wrath. *Shalom* (peace) represents the undisturbed harmony of heaven and earth which is God's gift to those whom He loves. Professor Lindblom went on to show how these ideas are related to the corresponding ideas of the New Testament. The idea of God as King ruling in the events of history is perfected in the revelation of God in the historical personality of Jesus Christ. God's love is now thought of as directed towards the sinner as sinner and not towards those who stood in a privileged relation to God. *Shalom*, which includes both spiritual and terrestrial values, is replaced by *εἰρήνη*, the spiritual privilege of peace.

Professor von Rad of Jena took as the subject of a very closely reasoned paper 'The Theological Problem of the Belief in Creation in the Old Testament.' His main contention was that, in the greater part of the Old Testament, the belief in Creation is dominated by the belief in God as Saviour, and is introduced merely as subsidiary to the soteriological conceptions, or as simply included in these. This is true even of the Creation-narrative in the first chapter of Genesis, which is just the prelude to a history of salvation that culminates in the expiatory institution of Aaron. On the other hand, Professor von Rad found in Ps 104, and in several passages in the Wisdom Literature, an entirely different view, the thought that the cosmos bears witness to God the Creator. He traced this to Egyptian influence—one notes the connexion with Professor Causse's view. In the discussion which followed, Professor Schmidt suggested that the reason why the Canaanite myth of the struggle of God with Chaos is the one which has left traces in the Old Testament is that in it we see God acting. God acts not only in history, but in creation. Professor Staerk explained the

connexion between creation and salvation by maintaining that for Hebrew thought Israel was the microcosm within the macrocosm of the Universe. Professor Stevenson, on the other hand, suggested an historical rather than a theological connexion between the ideas. For example, in Deutero-Isaiah, the prophet appeals to what God has done in Nature to prove that He is able to deliver His people.

It is fitting to close this survey of a series of lectures of unusual interest and distinction by allusion to that of Professor Weiser of Tübingen, who chose as his subject 'The Theological Task of Old Testament Studies,' which he rightly defined as the exegesis of the Old Testament. This must be distinguished, on the one hand, from history, which approaches the question of truth objectively; and, on the other hand, from so-called 'Biblical Theology,' which, starting from the Old Testament, seeks to construct an abstraction which is foreign to the Old Testament. The Old Testament does not reveal its message to any one who regards it from the standpoint of the non-participant spectator; it can be apprehended only by an act of cognition which compels the cognizant mind to a decision, and is, therefore, at the same time, an act of faith. The Old Testament theologian, however, has no other way in which to prosecute his task but the philosophical, historical, and critical method, which is the only safeguard against the dangers of subjectivity and allegorical exegesis. It is only as the theologian faces the truth about the Old Testament evidence that he will be able to appreciate it in a truly scientific and theologically satisfactory way.

It is hoped that even this brief survey of the contributions to Old Testament study made during a week which was full of interest will give an impression of the fine scholarship and high seriousness with which the Church's task of exegesis of Scripture is being carried out by some of those specially entrusted with it. The ultimate question at issue to-day is whether the Old Testament is to retain its position as part of the Church's rule of faith. It is a question which concerns not only the scholar, but every member of the Christian Church.

# Recent Foreign Theology.

## Maria.

THE current number of the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Töpelmann, Giessen; Band lii. Heft; 2-3) is unusually full and varied, perhaps because it is a double issue. It is dedicated to the very successful conference recently held in Göttingen, and thus suggests an expression of the international aspect of Biblical studies. The first article is by W. von Soden on one of the many problems presented by the Book of Daniel—the identity of the 'Nebuchadnezzar' of the book. It has long been recognized that he is not intended to be the historical king of that name, and even the advocates of a Maccabean date for the book as a whole would not see in him a cloak for Antiochus Epiphanes, but would assume a number of older stories used by the late author for his purpose. The theory now advanced is that both Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar are really Nabuna'id, the last Babylonian king. The case is well argued, with abundant reference to the Nabuna'id Chronicle.

In recent years the whole method of approach to the Higher Criticism of the Prophetic Literature has undergone a change. Dr. R. E. Wolfe prints an article (perhaps the most important in the whole number) on the editing of the Book of the Twelve. He has a theory that the 'Minor' Prophets underwent redaction by a series of no less than thirteen different editors or schools of editors before they reached their present form. While he ignores the modern approach, his studies may well prove to be of permanent value in helping to decide the dates at which various collections of prophetic material reached their present form. The article deserves close and reasoned study and comment; here it must suffice to point out that the basis for the whole discussion is the writer's belief that he can determine on internal grounds exactly what is original in each book. This is a method unfortunately only too easily open to the charge of subjectivity, but that should not blind the reader to the real merits of the work Dr. Wolfe has done.

A very interesting study is that of Mowinckel on the possibility of a national Israelite Epic Corpus. Of this he finds traces in the book of the 'Shîr,' mentioned in 1 K 8<sup>14</sup>, in the book of 'Hayyâshâr' cited in Jos 10<sup>12</sup>, 2 S 1<sup>18</sup>, and in the 'Book of the Wars of Yahweh' referred to in Nu 21<sup>14</sup>. He identifies the three collections with one another, and, since all the references are found in sections attributed to E, and nowhere in J

portions of the Old Testament, he argues that the compilation of the Epic must lie between the two. Here he finds new light on the relation between these two great bodies of Hebrew literature.

Shorter, but interesting, articles are contributed by Dornseiff, who continues his comparisons between Hebrew and other ancient literature, particularly that of Greece (the first instalment appeared in the previous volume, p. 57 ff.). Here he deals with Exodus. K. H. Ratschow propounds a theory that Ps 47 is a relic of an ancient Israelite cult of the king, used on his coronation. H. Thiersch, with numerous references to classical literature, discusses the true nature of the Ephod, and his explanation forms a useful contribution to this much discussed question. W. J. Chapman, an American scholar writing in German, discusses the real meaning of the chronological statement in 1 K 6<sup>1</sup>, though his account of the relations between Egypt and the early Israelite monarchy is not wholly probable. Finally we have the extraordinarily valuable analysis of current periodicals, with special reference to articles dealing with the Old Testament. This alone would make the *Z.A.W.* indispensable for any student who wished to keep abreast of current thought.

For many centuries—in fact, from the beginning of the Christian era down to the middle of the eighteenth century—there seemed to be no means whereby Hebrew poetry could be differentiated from prose. With the recognition of a special poetic form by Lowth, and its further development through Ley and his successors, we have at least a theory of the structure of Hebrew poetry. There are even those who carry this theory so far as to suggest that they doubt the existence of Hebrew prose. Some of the work of Sievers, for example, reduces to poetic form passages which must be prose if such a thing exists at all. The truth is that the Hebrew language itself is so musical (owing to the great strength of its accent), and its forms of expression so imaginative and figurative (as is always the case with a people which does not readily evolve abstract conceptions), that we need to be especially careful in our attempts to draw the line between the two main forms of speech.

These reflections are prompted by the appearance of a work on Gn 12-50 by a French Abbé, Mons. Devimeux, who endeavours to approach the subject from an entirely new and interesting point of view.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> D. Devimeux, *La Genèse*: Fascicule ii. *Les trois*

Unfortunately only the second part is before us, and it is not wholly fair to judge the work without reference to the first, in which, it seems, a good deal is explained which is here taken for granted. M. Devimeux has translated the whole of this section of Genesis, arranging his material in poetic lines and in strophes. At the end of each section we have a scheme showing how the strophes within it balance one another. The translation is extremely literal (the method reminds us of Aquila), and the author hopes thereby to give some idea of the actual Hebrew idiom. The most important part of the work is probably the preface in which the author's principles are explained, and in which he discusses the relation of his new method to the results claimed by the Graf-Wellhausen school.

While there is much of interest in the work, and while M. Devimeux himself makes a favourable impression on the reader's mind, it cannot be said that the experiment is a success. As has been already remarked, if Gn 12-50 is poetry, then there is no such thing as Hebrew prose. Many of the parallelisms claimed are simple repetitions, and the linking together of parallel strophes through similar or identical phrases recalls vividly D. H. Müller's 'Strophenbau und Responsion.' We may, further, doubt whether a slavishly literal rendering really helps the lay mind to appreciate idiom. We may render the Hebrew *wayy'hi* by 'And it came to pass' or (as M. Devimeux does) by 'Et fut,' but the fact remains that the word meant no more to the Hebrew speaker and hearer than a resumptive particle, much like the Greek *δέ*. Translation is always a problem; a free idiomatic rendering may be condemned as a mere paraphrase, and M. Devimeux is not to be condemned for going to the other extreme. He has made a brave experiment, even though it can hardly be said to have achieved success in any direction.

The value and importance of the Greek translation of the Old Testament can hardly be exaggerated. It was the Bible of the Early Church, and a large proportion of the quotations which appear in the New Testament were taken from it. It was, also, the Bible of a large and influential section of the Jewish people, especially of those who were resident in Egypt, and is invaluable as representing a textual tradition of which all Hebrew copies have long ago perished. Its accuracy in comparison with the Massoretic Text is a matter of dispute, but it must be admitted on all hands that it gives us by *Poèmes historiques: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob* (Geuthner, Paris).

far the most useful alternative to the traditional Hebrew. It is, therefore, a matter for remark that the critical studies necessary to produce a reliable text are still in their preliminary stages, and, though splendid work has already been done, especially in this country, by Swete and by Brooks and Maclean, we are often far from certainty as to what the original translators actually wrote.

We may, then, be profoundly thankful that the late Alfred Rahlfs was able to complete his edition of the LXX before his death.<sup>1</sup> It is an attempt to restore an original text, based on the three great MSS indicated by the symbols B, S (used by Rahlfs for the Codex Sinaiticus instead of the familiar *N*), and A. Here Rahlfs has done pioneer work, and, though he would not have claimed finality for his own text, he has certainly attained a larger measure of success than might have been expected from a first attempt. Perhaps finality will never be reached or even approached, if only because there seems to be evidence from time to time, which suggests that the Codex Alexandrinus represents an independent translation, and not simply a textual variant within the LXX itself.

It is impossible to deal adequately with such a work as this without introducing an enormous mass of detail, and a few remarks must suffice. The work, though produced in Germany, is adapted for the use of readers in other lands as well. The footnotes are in Latin, and the introductory matter, which includes the editor's preface, the publishers' notice, and a short history of the LXX, is in German, English, and Latin. Clearly the first was the original language, and one English rendering, at least, is misleading—the edition is described as a *Handausgabe* (which it is), and this appears in the English version as 'pocket edition' (which it is not). But this is a small matter, and the English version of the Introduction makes the book as useful in this country and in America as it is in its native land. But the most remarkable feature of the work is its price, which brings it within the reach of many for whom even Swete is too expensive.

The type is beautifully clear, and the volumes, though large, are not too large for the reader's comfort. We have every reason to commend this edition to English readers, and to thank the Würtemberg Bible Society for the splendid service it has rendered in producing it.

THEODORE H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

<sup>1</sup> *Septuaginta*, ed. Alfred Rahlfs (Privilegierte Würtembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart; vol. i. *Leges et Historiae*; vol. ii. *Libri poetici et propheticci*; R.M. 12).

## Contributions and Comments.

'Continue ye in my love'  
(John xv. 9).

As these words are commonly translated, they suggest, 'As the Father hath loved me, and I have loved you, continue ye to be so loved by me.' But the question arises, Is there a reasonable sequence of thought here? Can a man be fairly commanded to continue to *be* loved by God or Christ?

Before we go further with that point, something might be said about 'continue,' which R.V. rightly renders by 'abide.' There is something nerveless in permitting oneself merely to *be* loved, and this notion of quiescence is intensified by A.V.'s 'continue.' 'Continue' suggests mere duration, whereas *μένετε* points to something more tenacious and vigorous. We might compare the use of the same Greek word in Jn 8<sup>31</sup> ('continue' A.V., 'abide' R.V.), where there is a call to active obedience of the same kind as in 15<sup>7</sup>; or in 1 Jn 4<sup>16</sup>, 'He that dwelleth (abideth, R.V.) in love dwelleth in God,' where the thought is plainly 'he that loves' and not 'he that is loved.'

The Greek word occurs seven times in vv.4-7, and ten times in vv.4-10. Its use in these verses is mainly, directly or by application, of the abiding of a branch in its parent stem, an abiding, which so far from being passive, involves strenuous effort to maintain the connexion on which life depends.

To return. J. H. Bernard, in his note on this verse in *I.C.C.*, not unnaturally finds difficulty in the notion of being commanded to be loved, and writes: 'Continue in the *shelter* of my love,' while Westcott writes of continuing in the 'enjoyment of my love.' But shelter and enjoyment are both imported and alien notions, which mask the negativeness of the words 'continue in my love' as commonly understood.

Is not the difficulty met by connecting the words very closely with those which follow? Literally translated vv.9, 10 run: 'Even as the Father loved me, and I loved you, abide ye in my love. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in the love of me, even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in the love of him.'

'My love' undoubtedly suggests at first the subjective 'my love for you,' although Augustine, who accepts the words in this sense, writes: 'It is not clear which love he spoke of, the one we love with or the one with which he loves us' (*Migne*,

xxxv. 1844). But 'the love of me' and 'the love of him' in v.<sup>10</sup> would quite naturally have the objective sense, though in our A.V. they have been attracted into a subjective sense through the influence of 'my love' (*dilectio mea*, Vulg.) of v.<sup>9</sup>.

J. H. Bernard (*St. John*, i. 254), who interprets 'the love of God' objectively in Jn 5<sup>42</sup>, interprets it or a similar phrase of the love which man has for God in 1 Jn 2<sup>5, 15</sup> 3<sup>17</sup> 4<sup>12</sup> 5<sup>3</sup>.

There can be no doubt that in v.<sup>10</sup> the ordinary Johannine teaching would require 'love of me' and 'love of him' to be objective, *i.e.* 'love for me' and 'love for him.' Cf. Jn 14<sup>21</sup>, 'He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that *lovethe* me'; cf. Jn 14<sup>15</sup>, 'If ye *love* me, ye will keep my commandments,' and 1 Jn 5<sup>3</sup>, 'This is the love of God (*sc.* the love for God), that we keep his commandments.'

And accordingly, the seemingly inevitable rendering of v.<sup>10</sup> is, 'If ye keep my commandments, ye will abide in love for me, even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in love for him.'

Now, inasmuch as v.<sup>10</sup> develops directly the thought of v.<sup>9</sup>, indicating how the command it lays down is to be fulfilled, does it not follow that we should interpret 'abide ye in my love' (v.<sup>9</sup>) in terms of 'abide ye in love for me, as I abide in love for him' (v.<sup>10</sup>), and render the command in the sense not of 'continue to be loved by me,' but 'abide, or dwell (through obedience), in love for me'?

We should then have, 'As the Father loved me, and I loved you, abide ye in (the) love for me. If ye keep my commandments, ye will abide in (the) love for me, even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in (the) love for him.'<sup>1</sup> Thus we have a strong and closely knit sense, *sc.* 'the Father loves me, I love you, do you love me: you will love me if you keep my commandments, even as I keep my Father's commandments, and love Him,' with v.<sup>10</sup> completing v.<sup>9</sup>. And we are delivered from a translation of v.<sup>9</sup>, viz. 'continue to *be* loved by me,' which is so vague as virtually to mean nothing, and suggests, by commanding us to be loved by Christ, that His love for us depends

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Bernard writes that it is over-subtle to attempt a distinction between 'my love' (v.<sup>9</sup>), and 'the love of me' (v.<sup>10</sup>). This is very likely true. But if it is true, his argument tells as much in favour of the objective rendering of all three cases as of the more familiar subjective rendering.

on action of ours. Christ's pleasure in us may depend on our behaviour, but not so properly His love.

But can 'my love' (Vulg. *dilectio mea*) mean 'love for me'? There is no doubt that 'the love of God' can be used of the 'love for God,' cf. Lk 11<sup>42</sup>, Jn 5<sup>42</sup>, 2 Th 3<sup>5</sup>, Jude 21, but can 'my love' mean not only the love I have, but the love felt by others for me? I hope to show that this can be so.

It is interesting to find that the Vulgate's *dilectio mea* appears in the Latin form of the Collect for the Second Sunday after Trinity, 'quos in soliditate tuae dilectionis instituis,' the English form of which is, 'whom thou dost bring up in thy steadfast [fear and] love.' There can be no doubt that *tua dilectio* here is interpreted as 'love for thee.'

There are several examples from the Greek New Testament as well as from the Vulgate of this objective use of the pronominal adjective:

(i) Lk 22<sup>19</sup>; cf. 1 Co 11<sup>24, 25</sup> *in meam* (ἐμὴν) *commemorationem*, Vulg., 'in remembrance of me,' A.V. and R.V.

(ii) Ro 11<sup>31</sup>, *in vestram misericordiam*, V., 'through your (ὑμετέρῳ) mercy' (A.V.); 'by the mercy shewn to you' (R.V.); 'by that same mercy which was shown to you,' (Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 338).

(iii) Ro 15<sup>4</sup>, *ad nostram* (ὑμετέραν) *doctrinam*, V., 'for our learning' (A.V., R.V.), 'instruction' (Sanday and Headlam, *ad loc.*). The words plainly mean 'for the instruction of us.'

(iv) 1 Co 15<sup>31</sup>, *per vestram* (ὑμετέραν) *gloriam*, V., 'your rejoicing' (A.V.); 'that glorying in you' (Marg. 'your glorying') R.V.; 'As surely as I am proud of you' (Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, I.C.C., 361).

With the Greek examples might be compared certain Vulgate renderings of the Greek objective genitive by the pronominal adjective: Ps 27<sup>1</sup>, *Dominus illuminatio mea*; Lk 1<sup>80</sup>, *ostensionis suae*; Lk 19<sup>44</sup>, *visitationis tuae*; 1 Co 10<sup>11</sup>, *ad correp- tionem nostram*; 1 Th 1<sup>4</sup>, *electionem vestram*; He 9<sup>26</sup>, *per hostiam suam* (θυσίας αὐτοῦ); Rev 2<sup>18</sup>, *fidem meam* (cf. Swete, *Apocalypse*, 35, 'μου is the gen. of the object').

The same objective use can be seen in Mal 1<sup>6</sup>, 'Where is mine honour? Where is my fear?' And in Book of Common Prayer, 'departed this life in thy faith and fear.'

The above illustrations are sufficient to show that if a case is made out for the interpretation suggested above, there is nothing against it on linguistic grounds.

JOHN DUBLIN.

Dublin.

### Tὴν Ἀμαρτίαν (1 John iii. 4).

AN examination of St. John's use of the article with abstract nouns brings light and assurance to the student who is startled by the sweeping assertions of the Apostle. 'Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; he cannot sin, because he is born of God. . . . Whosoever is born of God sinneth not' (1 Jn 3<sup>9</sup> 5<sup>18</sup>).

These verses follow the Apostle's emphatic description of the horror of sin as he, at the moment, conceives of it. Sin is not a flash of ill-temper, a hasty word, a momentary angry blow. Sin is 'lawlessness' (R.V.). It is defiant rebellion against a God of love. 'Sin is the transgression of the Law,' that is, of God's expressed wish (1 Jn 3<sup>4</sup> A.V., but R.V. 'Sin is lawlessness'; ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐστίν ἡ ἀνομία).

The sin St. John is writing about is nothing less than deliberately opposing God and constantly or habitually opposing God. It is not mere momentary acts of selfishness. It amounts to apostasy.

Concerning such sin he says reasonably that no regenerate man sins. He cannot sin, because he is born of God. A man is regenerate when he has been taught to love God: 'every one that loveth is born of God' (1 Jn 4<sup>7</sup>). Consequently, he that is born of God, he that possesses the love of God in his soul, 'cannot' live in constant defiance of his Friend and Saviour. 'Whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him' (3<sup>6</sup>). If a man who was once a sincere Christian lives in such deliberate wilfulness, consciously grieving the heart of his Saviour, the love that once dwelt in his soul is non-existent, has been crushed out by the influences of the Evil One and of the Evil 'World.'

If a man says, Christ is God, and He died for me, but I will nevertheless oppose His wishes and disobey His word—that is the 'sin' St. John had in mind.

Now such an interpretation of these startling passages is sustained by noting St. John's use of the article with abstract nouns. He does not say that sin is lawlessness, but that 'THE sin is lawlessness.'

Abstract nouns are generally anarthrous (Winer, p. 148). But the article is inserted (see Ellicott on Philemon, 9) to give the noun *its most generic meaning and application*. 'The sin is the lawlessness' (ἡ ἀνομία ἐστίν ἡ ἀνομία, 1 Jn 3<sup>4</sup>) means that *sin as a whole* in human character and life is identical as a whole with defiance of God's wishes.

But what is 'sin as a whole' or 'sin in the abstract'? It is the subjective disposition in the soul of man to oppose God and His wishes or 'Law.'

St. Paul himself says so. 'To be carnally minded—to be led, not by the Spirit of God, but by the natural and unregenerate will—is *enmity against God* (εχθρα εις θεόν, Ro 8<sup>6</sup>).

So, Generic sin is Original sin, the inherited instinct leading us to seek our own way in opposition to the voice of Conscience—the Spirit of God. He who 'commits' a sin (vv.4, 5) projects into external action the universal attitude of opposition to God; commits 'the' sin, carries it into action. The subjective disposition is thus expressed in the objective world: πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν καὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιεῖ.

*Committing sin*, then, has in the Epistle of John a greater intensity of meaning than is ordinarily understood. He is thinking of a sinful life, not of a momentary act of selfishness. We can accept heartily the startling verses, 'Whosoever is born of God sinneth not. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin. He cannot sin, because he is born of God.' As Bishop Westcott expressed it, the words, 'Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not,' refer not to an arbitrary distinction between various actions: 'sin is the assertion of the selfish will against a paramount authority, violating the divine law. *Sinneth not* describes A CHARACTER, a PREVAILING HABIT, and not primarily an act.'

J. ALEX. CLAPPERTON.

Radlett, Herts.



## Did Joseph belong to Bethlehem or to Nazareth?

As is well known to students of the Gospels, the question of the relation of Joseph to the two most famous towns of Palestine after Jerusalem has given great trouble to commentators. Matthew makes Joseph a citizen of Bethlehem, to which place he is about to return from Egypt, but, fearing Archelaus, he went to Nazareth to get out of that ruler's dominions. But why to Nazareth rather than to any other town in Palestine? Luke makes him an inhabitant of Nazareth, who goes to Bethlehem only because his ancestor David belonged to that place. But is it likely that the Roman government would trouble to send him to register himself in Bethlehem merely because an ancestor a thousand years before belonged to that town? The Roman government was too practical to worry about such an archaeological question. Is there any solution of the question?

The Rev. D. J. Couvée, of the 'Gereformeerde'

(the dissenting Reformed) Church at Hillegersberg, in Holland, has published an interesting suggestion, which he thinks throws light on the subject. He considers that Bethlehem was Joseph's own city, not merely that of his ancestor David. This would explain why Joseph, two years after the birth of Jesus, on the arrival of the Wise Men, was still resident there, and after the flight to Egypt actually intended to return there. But what did Joseph do in Nazareth. The Gospels call Joseph a τέκτων, properly one who builds houses. Usually the word is translated carpenter, because a carpenter has so much to do with building. But in the Holy Land, where houses are built of stone, the meaning must be builder or mason. Now this master builder, or perhaps more modest mason, had his birthplace and residence in Bethlehem, but carried on his occupation in distant places, and so also in Nazareth. Now, in this connexion, it is remarkable that down to our time Bethlehem is a town of builders and masons, as Hebron is of potters. Still Bethlehem's builders go to distant places to seek work. Even now Bethlehem builders work in Nazareth, going there in the spring and returning home in November. We may therefore take it that Joseph, a builder working in Bethlehem, had found work for a considerable time in Nazareth. If he had belonged to Nazareth he would not have had to go to Bethlehem to register. But Bethlehem is his own town, which is confirmed by the fact that about the year A.D. 70 there were many descendants of David in Bethlehem or the immediate surroundings.

Such, in brief, is Mr. Couvée's suggested reconciliation of Matthew and Luke. Would New Testament experts accept it as throwing light on the difficulty?

JOHN A. BAIN.

Belfast.

## Matthew vi. 13 and v. 39.

THE meaning of these two passages, translated in the A.V. (a) 'Deliver us from evil,' (b) 'But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil,' has always been of great importance to the Christian. To-day both passages are frequently misunderstood, as the writer believes. No one who has much contact with young people is unaware of the fact that the faith of many has been shaken by a misunderstanding of the sayings. Greater knowledge and learning than the writer of this note possesses are needed to elucidate their meaning; but the problem that they present is set forth in the hope that some one will be able to throw more light upon it.

The Greek is (a) *ρῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ*, (b) 'Εγώ δέ λέγω ὑμῖν μη ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ. The word translated 'evil' in the A.V. also occurs in (c), Mt 5<sup>37</sup>, 'But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil' (ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἔστιν). The question immediately arises as to whether the words *τοῦ πονηροῦ* and *τῷ πονηρῷ* are masculine or neuter. The R.V. gives a personal meaning in each case, in (a) and (c) 'the evil one,' presumably a variant for 'the devil'; but in (b) 'him that is evil.' The last rendering seems remarkable, seeing that the three passages are so near together, and this will be considered later. At first sight the personal rendering appears to be the better. Possibly the Revisers favoured that rendering because it was more in accord with classical usage, the common opposite to *τὸ ἀγαθόν* or *τὸ καλόν*, 'the good,' being *τὸ κακόν*, 'the evil.' But in the N.T. and the Septuagint *τὸ πονηρόν* is often substituted for *τὸ κακόν*, e.g. in Ro 12<sup>9</sup> and Gn 2<sup>17</sup>. In the latter passage in the phrase 'the tree of the knowledge of good and evil' we have the words *καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν*. Hence there is a possibility of the A.V. translation's being right in (a) and (b) as well as in (c). Are there any passages in the N.T. that might help us? There are probably repetitions or echoes of such important sayings of our Lord. Jn 17<sup>15</sup>, 'I pray . . . that thou shouldest keep them from the evil' ('the evil one,' R.V.), is probably such a repetition, but it does not help us. Nor is 2 Th 3<sup>3</sup>, 'The Lord . . . shall . . . keep (R.V. 'guard') you from evil' (*ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ*), conclusive, although the use of the verb *φυλάσσω* favours the personal rendering. But in 2 Ti 4<sup>18</sup> we have, 'The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work' (from all wrong-doing?). Here the same verb, *ρύσεται*, is used as in (a). Is not this an echo of the Lord's Prayer? If so, it favours the A.V. translation, 'evil,' for *τῷ πονηρῷ*. Moreover, the verb *ρύομαι* in the active sense is, the writer thinks, always used in the N.T. of delivering from some thing, not from some person. This gives further weight to the A.V. rendering. If the clause in the Lord's Prayer were rendered 'Deliver us from wrong-doing' or 'Deliver us from sin,' there would be no ambiguity. As it stands, many young people, in accordance with the modern outlook, when they use it, mean, 'Deliver us from accident, misfortune, failure, and sickness.' I do not suggest that it is improper to pray such a prayer, but it is not the meaning of the clause in the Lord's Prayer. When a misfortune befalls any of these young people, their faith is shaken, because they think that they have a right to expect

that their petition will be answered by protection from misfortune since it is authorized by our Lord Himself. Hence the necessity of changing the phraseology, however time-honoured it may be.

The writer, therefore, suggests that the word 'evil,' if properly defined, is probably the correct rendering in (a).

The passage (b) presents greater difficulty. As it stands, whether the words *τῷ πονηρῷ* are rendered 'evil' (A.V.) or 'him that is evil' (R.V.), to the ordinary man the saying is unintelligible. Our business as Christians is to resist moral evil and the worker of evil to the utmost, even as our Master did. Indeed, it was this that brought Him to the Cross. Young people either frankly say that the command is nonsense, or, if they happen to be pacifists, that professing Christians are hypocrites, otherwise they would not maintain an army and navy for defence, seeing that Jesus said, 'Resist not evil.'

It was quite natural for the Revisers to hesitate to translate *τῷ πονηρῷ* by 'the evil one' in keeping with their rendering in (a) and (c), as such a rendering would be nonsense. St. James is evidently right when he says, 'Resist (ἀντιστῆτε) the devil, and he will flee from you.' See also 1 P 5<sup>9</sup>. But is the rendering, 'Resist not him that is evil,' any better? A remark of an old commentator, Dean Alford, is to the point here. 'Taken slavishly and literally,' he says, 'neither did our Lord Himself conform to this precept (John xviii. 22, 23), nor His Apostles (Acts xxiii. 3).' I take this to mean that the only way to explain this passage, as it stands, is to explain it away. My younger friends will not allow this. They say, and I think rightly, that such an explanation does not accord with their principle of 'absolute honesty.' But are both 'Resist not evil' and 'Resist not him that is evil' mistranslations? Or is the text corrupt? The other parts of the N.T. ought to be of some help to us. As in the case of (a), there will probably be echoes of the passage in the Epistles. In Ro 12<sup>17</sup>, 'Render to no man evil for evil,' R.V. (*μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδίδοντες*), we surely have such an echo, and one which would naturally follow the words preceding (b). There is a similar exhortation in 1 Th 5<sup>15</sup>, 'See that none render evil for evil unto any man,' and in 1 P 3<sup>9</sup>, 'Not rendering evil for evil.' The preposition *ἀντί* occurs in all three passages, and is the important part of the verb *ἀντιστῆναι* in (b). Can it be, then, that *μη ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ* is a condensed phrase with the same meaning? Has *ἀντιστῆναι* two meanings based upon the two radical meanings of *ἀντί*, 'against'

and 'in return for'? The second meaning of the preposition is found in the compounds ἀντιλοιδορέω, 1 P 2<sup>23</sup>; ἀντιλυτρος, ransom, 1 Ti 2<sup>6</sup>; ἀντιμετρέω, measure in return, Mt 7<sup>2</sup>; ἀντιμοσθία, recompense, Ro 1<sup>27</sup>, and elsewhere. The verb ἀντιλαμβάνομαι, used probably with this sense of the prefix in Lk 1<sup>54</sup>, has also in classical Greek the other meaning, 'against.' Does ἀντιστῆναι mean either 'resist' or 'render in return,' 'pay back,' 'reciprocate'? If so, (b) means 'do not reciprocate evil,' 'do not repay evil with evil.' Rev. A. Carr, in the *Cambridge Greek Test. for Schools*, gives the translation, 'do not seek to retaliate evil'; but he does not say how he arrived at it. Such a meaning would exactly suit the context, and if 'smite on the right cheek' is an ordinary Aramaic expression for

'insult,' as Professor J. Alexander Findlay states, St. Peter's word, 'not rendering evil for evil or reviling for reviling' is an exact parallel of both clauses in Mt 5<sup>39</sup>. Moreover, Ro 12<sup>14. 17-21</sup> is a true echo and interpretation of the whole passage, Mt 5<sup>39-44</sup>.

In all three passages (a), (b), and (c), therefore, the writer would suggest that the rendering, 'evil,' of the A.V., if properly defined, is preferable to that of the R.V.; and he would earnestly plead for a new revision of the N.T., or, if that is impracticable, a list of emendations with the authority of the Christian Church behind it, lest we place unnecessary stumbling-blocks in the path of 'the little ones' of Christ.

H. E. BRYANT.

Grimsby.

## Entre Nous.

### Old Testament Problems.

The casual reader of Old Testament theology may be forgiven if he is sometimes tempted to the cynical belief that 'all things are in a state of flux.' Everywhere there is movement; new discoveries, and their interpretation, new theories, new lines of approach—all seem to jostle one another in the race for predominance, and each is attended by a swarm of critics. Yet there is real progress, and it is possible to see steady development along the broad lines of increasing knowledge. There are questions which still lack an answer, and many others to which the best answer available is clearly imperfect or uncertain. Yet there are opinions on which general agreement may be claimed, and these serve as starting-points for further advance.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES is thus endeavouring to fulfil one of its essential functions in the series of articles on 'Some Outstanding Old Testament Problems' which begins in the present issue. In each case the writer will try to state the actual problem, give a short account of the more significant attempts to solve it, especially in recent years, and, if possible, add some original contribution, which may help to bring a final answer one step nearer. There are two dangers to be avoided. One is that of ultra-conservatism, which refuses to admit the possibility of a new idea, and judges every suggestion by the standard of a well-established position. The other is that of the restless instability which takes no heed of the valid work already done, and is liable to be stamped by the driven leaf of the

frailest new suggestion. While it is true that there is no such thing as a critical orthodoxy, it is also true that the greatest of scholars is fallible, and, while a novel theory is entitled to serious consideration, it by no means follows that it is to be accepted merely on the authority of a distinguished man of learning. It must stand the test of inquiry and discussion, and can claim validity only when it appeals to the profound instinct for truth.

The question of that instinct for truth lies at the root of our deepest Biblical problem, the Inspiration of Scripture, and this will be treated in the next issue by a scholar who holds a unique position in the realm of Old Testament theology. Other problems are raised by archæological discovery; here we may include the article on the Exodus which appears in the present issue, a later discussion by Dr. J. W. Jack, and elements in several others. Fuller appreciation of philological and historical facts gives rise to questions on such Books as Daniel, Ezekiel, and Chronicles, each of which will be discussed by a scholar known in learned circles to be competent for the task. A similar remark may be made of the problems of the post-exilic Jewish community. Wider acquaintance with other forms of religion throws new light on many aspects of Old Testament study; the two selected for special treatment are the development of the idea of God and the meaning and ritual of Sacrifice. Finally, there are lines of fuller knowledge opened up by the insight of original minds into the text of the Old Testament

itself; a good example will appear in an article by one of the most brilliant of our younger scholars dealing with the place taken by the prophet in Israelite worship.

It cannot be claimed that the list of articles in this series is exhaustive—far from it. But the subjects chosen include those which have aroused most discussion in recent years, and each is treated by a competent expert. None claims finality, but each article may be regarded as an adequate 'interim report' on the progress that has been made. None of our readers can hope to keep abreast of *all* the technical work which is constantly appearing, but it is hoped that this series will do something, both to indicate the present situation, and to facilitate appreciation of new work as it appears.

#### God's Love.

A man lost his wife to whom he was devotedly attached. Her passing left him a stunned and broken man. He had one child, a girl of twelve. Thinking that a sea voyage might restore his health he went upon a cruise, taking his daughter with him. One day the child picked up a hymn book in the saloon of the steamer, after the Sunday morning service. Opening it her eyes lighted upon the lines :

For the love of God is broader  
Than the measures of man's mind.

'What does that mean, daddy?' the child asked.

They stood on an upper bridge and looked over a sea which hemmed them in on every side. And the father said to his child, 'Look all round, dear; it is all water as far as you can see, on every side. And it is deep too. We could not measure it, could we? Well, that is what the verse means when it says the love of God is broader than the measures of man's mind. We can't get to the end of it, or to the bottom of it.' In a moment the girl said, 'Why, daddy, then we're in the middle of it.'<sup>1</sup>

#### A Gracious Atmosphere.

Dr. F. W. Boreham's latest book is *Ships of Pearl* (Epworth Press; 5s. net). In it he tells many good stories and among them the following. A commercial traveller visiting a little town in England was mystified by a most delicious perfume which he suddenly felt at noon, although nowhere could he see a garden plot. His friend explained, 'The syren was the signal for the girls at the perfume-factory to leave for lunch, and, in scurrying up and down the street, they distributed the fragrance everywhere!'

<sup>1</sup> F. C. Spurr, *The Man Who holds the Keys*, 22.

And Dr. Boreham draws this lesson. 'It was when the Church breathed on the world the spirit of Jesus that men saw the anomalies of slavery and set the bondmen free. It was when John Wesley and his companions brought about the spiritual revival of the eighteenth century that all the conditions of life, commerce, and industry were transfigured. And only so far as the Church succeeds in scattering broadcast that gracious atmosphere, leading men to hate war and to love peace, will it be possible for any League of Nations or Disarmament Conference to bind the nations together in the bonds of universal brotherhood.'

#### God and You.

Dr. H. McLachlan, Principal of the Unitarian College in Manchester, has written an account, in the form of nine biographical sketches, each fully documented, of an outstanding Unitarian family. The founder of the family was John Relly Beard (1800-1876), Minister and Educationist. The title is *Records of a Family* (Manchester University Press; 8s. 6d. net). Most space is given to the career of one of John Relly Beard's granddaughters, Mary Dendy, who made the feeble-minded her care. When Manchester University conferred the M.A. degree on her, Professor Conway said, 'Miss Dendy undertook a long and arduous investigation, in which she examined seventy thousand cases of defective intelligence, scattered throughout the elementary schools of the country; and, during the thirteen years in which she has been a Member of the Manchester Education Authority, her persuasive influence has led to the establishment of four separate schools for this class of children, and, when this school dismisses them at the age of sixteen, her farm and home at Sandlebridge receives them for permanent care, and creates for them happy, and even useful occupations.'

'The first reference to Sandlebridge in Miss Dendy's *Diary*, 3 June, 1902, runs: "Helped to bathe my boys and put them to bed. Stayed all night. Thank God for a beginning." The death of inmates was always a grief to her. When one of the boys died, she recalled how a month earlier, 17 June, 1906, in answer to her question: "Joe, who takes care of good little boys?" he replied: "God and you."